NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

Without Concealment----Without Compromise.

VOLUME V.---NO. 16. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1844. WHOLE NUMBER 224.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.
At 142, Nassau Street, New-York.

Sydney Howard Gay,
Maria Weston Chapman, } **Editors.**
Edmund Quincy,

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to SYDNEY HOWARD GAY.

Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or to S. H. GAY, Assistant Treasurer, at New-York.

TERMS.—$2 00 a year, in advance; $2 50 if not paid within six months.

☞ $10 00, in advance, will pay for SIX copies, for one year, sent to one address.

☞ TWENTY copies, or more, will be sent to one address, at $1 50 each.

☞ Subscribers can remit money without expense by observing the following rule of the Post-Office Department: "A postmaster may enclose money in a letter to the publisher of a newspaper, to pay the subscription of a third person, and frank the letter, if written by himself."

H. M. HENRY, PRINTER.

"The Peculiar Institution."

From the Albany Cultivator.

AGRICULTURE AT THE SOUTH.

A few weeks ago, a friend of ours was about to take a journey on business, and as he would remain some time in a certain district where we had no subscribers, he concluded, as well as ourselves, that he might collect a few to add to our list. In a letter from him, dated, "———, January 7th, 1844," he says: "I have lately taken a ride of twelve miles from this city, and returned by a different road. I saw but one building that could be construed into an apology for a barn. "How do you manage without barns?" said I to one of the best farmers I met with." "O," said he, "we have no use for barns, we have nothing to put in them." "How do you thresh your wheat?" I inquired. "We do not make any wheat." Your rye, then?" "We do not make any rye." "What do you do with your hay?" "Neither do we make any hay," was his reply. "What do you give your horses during the winter?" "The tops and blades of corn." "And how are your cows provided for?" "We let them take their chance in the fields among the stalks; they make out to live till spring." This same farmer told me that he had not manured an acre of land, nor a hill of corn, for nine years! "And what," I asked, "is an average crop of corn?" "A barrel to the thousand hills." "And how many hills do you reckon to the acre?" "Two thousand." "And how many bushels to the barrel?" "Five." "Then your crop of corn is ten bushels to the acre?" "Yes, we are satisfied with that, and half of us do not get that much." "Have you marl here?" I inquired. "Yes, we have plenty of it three or four feet below the surface, but it is too much trouble to dig it." I mentioned your poudrette—"O," said he, "a dollar and fifty cents a barrel would make it cost too much." Seeing a little girl busily engaged in shaking a quart bottle, I asked what she had in it. She answered, cream, and that she was making butter! I conclude, therefore, that a farmer who has a horse and cart—a wooden plough, rope traces, and a corn-husk collar, and a quart bottle to churn his milk in, feels himself amply prepared for conducting a farm in these *diggings*, without wasting a dollar a year for the Farmer's Cabinet! A most legitimate conclusion, truly! we should have come to the same, precisely, had we been canvassing, ourselves, instead of our friend. Where would be the use in stirring up a neighborhood that was quietly reposing upon a belief in the perfection of its primitive habits, and in making it feel its own privations, by showing it the superior privileges of others! If a man is content from year to year, and from generation to generation, with ten bushels of corn to the acre, with his wooden plough, husk collar, and a quart bottle churn, why ask him to waste his money on an agricultural paper, that would make him dissatisfied with them all. Our friend also informed us, that overtaking a boy who was returning in his cart from market, he inquired how far he had come—what his load of marketing had consisted of, and how much he had obtained for it? He said he had just sold his load of fodder—he had brought it nine miles—and got sixty-two and a half cents for it! We could make quite a chapter of reflections upon these little incidents, but as they would not reach the *infected* district—for no subscribers were obtained—and as those of our readers will be quite as wise as our own, we leave each one to supply his own.

SLAVERY AS IT IS.

We have rarely met with a more revolting instance of inhumanity and hypocrisy, than the one recently related at a public meeting at Cincinnati, by Rev. Mr. Boucher, a Methodist minister, who formerly resided at the South.

While he was on the Alabama Circuit, he spent a Sabbath with an old circuit preacher, who was also a doctor, living near the "Horse Shoe," celebrated as Gen. Jackson's battle ground. Early Monday morning, he was reading Pope's Messiah to Mr. Boucher, when his wife called him out. Mr. Boucher glanced his eye out of the window, and saw a slave man standing by, and the husband and wife consulting over him. Presently the doctor took a raw-hide from under his coat, and began to cut up the half-naked back of the slave. Several inches of the skin turned up, perfectly white, at every stroke, until the whole back was red with gore. At first the lacerated man cried out in his agony; at which the Doctor and Divine cried out at every stroke, "WON'T YE HUSH! WON'T YE HUSH!" till finally the slave stood still, and bore the tortures with only a groan.

As soon as he had completed his task, the Doctor came in, panting, and almost out of breath, and, addressing Mr. Boucher, said, "*Won't you go to prayer with us, sir?*" The amazed circuit rider fell upon his knees and prayed, uttering he hardly knew what. When he left the house, the poor creature of a slave had crept up and knelt at the door during prayer, with his body gory with blood down to his very heels.

Congregational Journal.

VIRGINIA.

A correspondent of the National Intelligencer, writing from Wilton, near Richmond, Virginia, thus speaks of the diminution in the population of that State:

"Thus much have I written, with an eye to tempt to Virginia, Northern farmers. I have a great desire to capture this good old Commonwealth for the Yankee stock of States. Land is cheap; I say land, of which a good farm may soon be made, at from three to ten dollars an acre—not the land on the banks of the river, cleared and cultivated, but land where marl lies, marl worth more to the land than a gold mine. Society is good. The people are a good people. Schools will come with a population. It often seems to me that as yet there are no people here, and I wish, therefore, to see them come. I have to take up a spy-glass to see the houses of my neighbors, they are so far off, and yet so near am I to a capital of about 24,000 inhabitants, that I can see its spires and steeples, and almost hear the hum of its laborers. Back of me, and below me, off of the river as far as I have explored, I cannot find much else but woods, woods, woods. I ride for miles and miles in the forests, looking for people. And yet this is the first settled, and oldest settled part of Virginia! The people have gone off; they have settled in Georgia, Alabama, Kentucky, Missouri, Mississippi, Louisiana, Florida; and now, as if there were too many people left, a bribe is held out to the rest to go to Texas! Well, if they will go, all I can say is, Northern farmers, come here and settle. Such land as you can sell in New-York and Pennsylvania for fifty, and seventy-five, and a hundred dollars an acre, you can buy here for from three to ten. It is a shame, I say, that this beautiful country, so blest in climate, and needing so little, only the fertilizing hand of man, should be without people. Here is an old venerable river running past my door, older than the Hudson, now lined with towns and villages—much older than the Ohio, (older in settlement and geography, I mean,) but where are the people? For a hundred and fifty miles from Richmond to Norfolk, the first explored river running into the Atlantic Ocean, the home of Powhatan and Pocahontas, and the scenes of the truly chivalrous John Smith—*where are the people?* Gone, I say, gone to the South and West, the trumpet blowing among them now to go to Texas! Virginia has here depopulated herself to make homes elsewhere. The cry of one set of her politicians is, manufactures that would keep the people here are *nothing*; Texas is *everything*. Were I a Virginian, I should esteem as worth more on James river, one good white man, than all of Texas, from the Sabine to the Rio del Norte. Why, here is Texas all about us, land as cheap as in the distant Texas, and as good."

$25 REWARD.—Absconded from the subscriber's plantation, near Benton, Alabama, on the 18th of September last, a negro man named NED. He is very black, ordinary height, say five and a half feet; is branded on the forehead with the letters A. M. and on each cheek with the letters J. G. The former he probably conceals by allowing his hair to cover it, and the latter are concealed by whiskers, and an examination may be necessary to discover them. As he will doubtless refuse to disclose his real owner's name, these brands are sufficient to identify him.

I will pay the above reward of twenty-five dollars for apprehending and lodging him in any jail, so that I can get him, and giving me information of the same at Selma, Alabama; and a reasonable additional reward will be paid, if delivered to me, or to Mr. R. A. NICOLL, of Mobile.

ANTHONY M. MINTER.

☞ The New Orleans Picayune will publish the foregoing advertisement weekly till forbid, and payment for the same will be made by Mr. R. A. Nicoll, of Mobile, on presentation.—*Selma Free Press.*

KIDNAPPING IN VERMONT.

A correspondent of the Green Mountain Freeman gives an account of the kidnapping of a colored girl in the free State of Vermont. The facts are these: A fellow named Bailey, from Georgia, was on a visit to his relatives in Vermont, and had brought with him a colored girl, whom he claimed as his slave. She, finding she was free by the laws of the State, left her pretended owner, intending to secrete herself till his departure. Unwilling, however, to relinquish his prey, he obtained the help of as great a scoundrel as himself, named Samuel Nutt, of Hartford, Windsor county—a contemptible creature, who, for a consideration, was willing to act as the jackal of the Southern woman-stealer. This Nutt discovered the place of the girl's retreat—and himself and his employer bound her with cords, threw her into a wagon, and the slaveholder immediately drove off with his victim. We have no words to express our idea of the baseness of this Northern tool of the Southern kidnapper. We called him a jackall, for which we feel that we owe an apology to that comparatively respectable animal. If there is law in Vermont, Nutt should at once be indicted for kidnapping, and made to suffer the full penalty of his crime.

Pro-Slavery.

From the New-York Sun.

THE ENGLISH IN INDIA—BRITISH SLAVERY.

Much of the troubles and divisions, the sectional difficulties and heartburnings existing between the Eastern, Northern, and Southern States of our republic, doubtless originate with the fanatical and inconsiderate Abolitionists: they have everywhere planted seeds of domestic troubles and national danger, which all can see and, feel without being able to eradicate. Exercising the utmost charity for their motives, in attempting to put an end to Slavery, we cannot, nevertheless, extend to Great Britain—the aider, the abettor, and protector of abolition—the merit of a generous, liberal, and just interference in this matter; but from the time of the massacre in St. Domingo to the present moment, attribute every effort to suppress domestic slavery to political objects, and not humane considerations—to a desire to weaken the power and undermine the resources of rival nations—to interfere with their domestic concerns—to "divide and conquer." The time has arrived when the mask which covers so much iniquity should be removed; the civilized world should look behind the veil containing so much national deformity, and make themselves familiar with the motives which control the Government, and the distinction between acts and pretensions. In abolishing slavery in the British West India Islands at an enormous expense, two motives governed the English Cabinet—one was gradually to destroy the value of those possessions, which were a burden to the British, and in time bring them to decay; the other to conceal the slavery in other possessions by yielding to the clamors of the abolitionists in relation to the West Indies. This country has been deeply, seriously, and most effectually injured by the active interference of Great Britain in our slave question. While at peace with her, and maintaining a most active and valuable commercial intercourse, she has by her abolition agents, stirred up the North against the South, and brought us to entertain the question of a dissolution of the Union, and most sincerely desires to weaken the power of the Republic, by bringing about that division. We have only to refer to her unusual efforts to defeat the annexation treaty, and her unconcealed expressions of satisfaction at the rejection of that treaty. The motive before the world is to check the spread of Slavery, and with this fair and humane profession, England claims the support of the free and liberal. Look at India; look at the slavery in India!—the subjugation of millions—the actual slavery in which England holds, and has held, that country from the time of Warren Hastings—and contrast her acts with her loud professions of humanity, and see how the account stands. A cotemporary, with a view of presenting the conduct of Great Britain on this subject in its proper light, has been at some pains to collect authentic facts in relation to her rule in India. In reference to labor, we learn, on the authority of the Madras Revenue Board, that the cultivator in India has his work assigned to him; the revenue officers compel him to labor in particular fields, the taxes of which must be paid whether under cultivation or not. If he leaves the spot through oppresion, he is harassed wherever he goes; but he cannot leave, owing to poverty, unless he becomes Dacoit or Pindaree, and robs for a livelihood. This is a worse condition than that of the slaves in the United States, and calls more loudly for redress at the hands of humanity. This mode of oppression toward the great body of Hindoos has an effect proper to the cause.

There are no public works in Hindoostan—no railroads or canals—nothing in which the outlay of money is involved, excepting fortifications; and yet it is computed that in sixty years ONE THOUSAND MILLIONS of pounds sterling have been levied upon and collected from the Hindoos.

The country was gained and is still maintained by the sword. Villages, which some few years ago were flourishing, have entirely decayed. The villages in the Northwestern provinces are deserted; there are districts wholly abandoned. In 1837 the famine extended over 20,000,000 of people; about 50,000 perished. The rivers were choked with the dead bodies where there is a superabundance of waste land; the air putrified with the stench of dead and dying human beings and animals; the jackals and vultures were seen preying upon the still animated bodies. Mothers drowned their children by night, unwilling that the morning should witness their famished state; and whole families of respectability poisoned themselves rather than beg a little rice for their support, although a rupee's worth (two shillings) of grain would sustain a man for thirty days; and hydrophobia was becoming as prevalent as cholera. The deaths in Agra, from famine, in 1837, were at the rate of ten thousand a month, a destruction of life that would sweep off the whole population in less than twelve months. The dead at Cawnpore lay in heaps by the roadside, and there were two establishments formed, one to bring the corpses to the river-side, and the other to keep pushing the bodies down the stream. Parts of India, depopulated by oppression, have become terrific jungles.

The writers of the present day give this gloomy picture of the English rule in India. The ministry grow pale when talking of a few blacks in our Southern States; and yet the people of that little Island, not larger than this State, hold in bondage, by their arms and money, *one hundred millions of people*, horribly oppressed, and ground to the earth in sustaining a military despotism. They talk of our lust of conquest, because we desire to re-annex a territory formerly our property, and on honorable terms; while they have captured and annexed nearly one half of India—part of Africa—a great portion of America, and islands in Greece, Mediterranean, and the West Indies. They have attacked and captured vessels of war belonging to nations with whom they were at peace—and with the responsibility of these prominent and actual wrongs, they charge us with ambition to acquire additional territory.

Francis Jackson, a distinguished citizen of Boston, a strong "Liberty man," President of an Anti-Slavery Society, &c. is out in a letter in the Boston Courier, returning his commission as justice of the peace.—*Express.*

That is the way the Whig papers are trying to secure the votes of abolitionists for Henry Clay. Mr. Jackson is not a "Liberty" man at all, and never was, but has from the beginning been at the head of that branch of abolitionists who are lauded and supported by the Whigs, and who are seeking to disband the churches, as a step towards the dissolution of all organizations, and the prostration of all human government and authority, save and except the authority of their "Napoleon." He is *your* man, gentlemen. The Berkshire Whig makes a statement so gross that we can hardly believe it designed, and yet it seems more difficult to believe it the result of ignorance.

"Mr. Francis Jackson, Liberty candidate for Lieutenant Governor of this State, has returned to the Governor his commission as justice of the peace, because he can no longer suffer the oath to support the Constitution of the United States to 'lie upon his soul.'"

The Whig is in constant receipt of the Emancipator, and has been for years, and *must* have known that the "Liberty candidate for Lieutenant Governor," is *William* Jackson, of Newton, formerly a member of Congress, and as little tinctured with megrims as Governor Briggs.

We wish people to understand that these men are the instruments or tools of the Whigs, uniting with and aiding them, and encouraged and supported by them, for the sake of their opposition to the Liberty party—one class opposing the Liberty party, and seeking its destruction, because it stands in the way of the election of a slaveholder, and the other because it stands in the way of the overthrow of the Constitution.—*Emancipator.*

Selections.

The three following articles are from the Baltimore Visitor. The bold and manly tone of its editor upon the subject of Slavery is worthy of all commendation, and should put to the blush the cringing sycophants north of Mason and Dixon's line, who dare not, for their bread and butter, mention the subject except to abuse the Abolitionists:

SLAVE-TRADE HORRORS.

The Portuguese schooner Ezpcranza, of 44 tons, lately condemned by the Mixed Commissioned Court, and broken up for sale, was commissioned for the coast of Africa, for the Mozambique, with a crew of ten men, and provisions for fifteen days (!!!) was to take in 220 slaves, or if small bales—so the slaves are termed—250! and easily packed—in the space of (what?—) the hold of a vessel of 44 tons, with the heighth of 32 inches!—ay, inches! between the slave, or under and the upper deck! Manacles and chains were on board, to the number of 900 for another cargo. And with provisions for fifteen days was this frightful freight—this cargo of human misery, to cross the wide Atlantic—to traverse at a bird's flight nearly 4000 miles. Suppose calms, or adverse winds, or storms occurred; suppose the voyage was delayed for 20 days, to no port dare the slave ship run; from no vessel dare she seek assistance—250 human beings, without water or food, crammed into a space not high enough to sleep when lying down in one position, for 20 days and nights, in a hold fetid with their own filth, without ventilation; with a putrid and foul atmosphere, on a deck thirty-two inches from the ceiling. Can any fiction, any romance, portray what might have been the bitter agony—the torture of these Africans? A slave can be purchased for ten bars of baft, or ten pieces of blue cloth—say 20 shillings, and will fetch at Brazils $480, or often £125; the immense profit renders the slave traders regardless of human life. One slave in every ten, if brought to Cuba or Brazils, yields an ample return; and anxious as cruisers may be to check this vile traffic, the western coast of Africa is too extensive for the fleet employed to watch it effectually.

Commenting on this vile traffic, the Philadelphia Ledger says: It is now clearly and indisputably ascertained that this traffic has not diminished by the efforts of European and American powers to suppress it, but has, of late years, actually increased; and thus its atrocity, while equally intense, is more diffusive than formerly. As a system of colossal piracy, national murder, and relentless and endless war upon humanity, it deserves the blasting thunders of malediction, and the terrible punishment of outraged justice. No trial can be too speedy, no sentence too awful for actors, aiders, and abetters in this enormous crime. If a Government partakes of the iniquity, it deserves moral impalement, and, gibbeted as embodied infamy, it should swing as carrion in the stormy breath of universal indignation. The might and majesty of Christendom—the great sympathies of our common nature moved for human desolation and despair—the sense and sentiment—the light and soul of the age, should rise up against this damning iniquity, and sink it ocean-deep with the guilty blood of its accursed authors!

OUR COLORED POOR.

A meeting of a number of free colored people, was lately held in the basement room of Warfield's Church—Rev. Darius Stokes presiding, and J. C. Fortie acting as Secretary—whose object is an exceedingly laudable one—nothing less than the provision for the poor of their own class. We are informed by a communication from the secretary, that they resolved themselves into a permanent association for the purpose named, so as to anticipate the wants of the poor during the winter. This is well—and we hope the movements of the white friends of the poor, may not be damped by this measure. There is abundance of work for all.

With such a spirit as that here exhibited by our colored population, who will dare sneer, as some heartless man-shaped beings have done, when we applaud them for the energy with which they have conducted their movements in temperance and religion—movements which every tax-paying white man with a grain of sense, would naturally recommend as a matter of public economy—taking the most selfish view.

But it is not in this light we uphold these movements. We see in them heart cheering evidence of the improvability of the colored race, which no philosopher can doubt, as he beholds such self-elevating and self-sustaining energy as is so frequently exhibited under legal and social circumstances so very unfavorable. We pity the man, wherever found, who has no eye wherewith to see, and no heart wherewith to sympathize, while such cheering proofs of human progress are before him!

POWER OF CONGRESS.

The following remarks are from an article on a non-committal letter of Mr. Frelinghuysen. The Visitor is left to assume from the letter that this Whig candidate believes that Congress has the power to abolish Slavery in the District. Its own remarks, however, are, in the main, just.

We would that all the candidates took this ground. We believe, with Mr. Frelinghuysen, that Congress can derive from the Constitution no legislative power over Slavery in the States; but, at the same time, we are as firmly convinced that there exists in that instrument, ample authority for legislation with respect to the District of Columbia—and we hope to behold the seat of our common Government freed ere long from the curse of Slavery. We believe it may be done amicably. The step is due to our brethren of the North, as well as to our fame as a nation claiming a proud place among nations. In the eyes of foreigners, that little square of ten miles has been the cause of more national odium than the whole of the wide territory embraced in the southern States.

What very naturally aggravates the grievances of our brethren of the North, is the shameful extent to which the detestible domestic traffic in human blood and bones—ay, human *souls*—is carried on under the very eyes of a class of men who, whatever their misapprehension of many things pertaining to *hereditary* slavery, no doubt honestly and conscientiously believe that slavery is a violation of the laws of nature, and therefore not to be justifiably acquiesced in by those so viewing it. Now, even under the supposition that the opinions of such, are ill-founded (*fanatical*, if you please, fellow-southerners, whose patient ear we think we have a right to claim) they are entitled to respect, being just as fixed and honest as your own. It is a mistake to suppose there are no honest Anti-Slavery men in the northern States—no men of disinterestedness—that *we* are the exclusive possessors of all the candor and sincerity in the land—that all true benevolence will be buried with our bones! Such would really seem to be the notion of certain of our own great men, as the late speech of the talented and eloquent McDuffie, in Virginia, too plainly evinced.

It really pains us beyond measure, while perceiving, as we do, the utter fanaticism of some of the writers and speakers of the North, to find Southerners exhibiting feelings equally fanatical.* And we, therefore, beseech those over whose minds our peculiar position may allow us to exert somewhat of influence, to preserve a calmer tone! Recrimination can do no good—it must do immense harm. Harmony is what is wanting—a spirit of compromise—that spirit which directed our Forefathers in their peliberations.

* The following toast was offered and well received at a meeting in South Carolina, on the 4th of July:

THE NORTHERN ABOLITIONISTS.—The Robespieres and Brissots of modern date, they aim at the amalgamation of all colors and classes.

EXTRACT FROM MR. EMERSON'S FIRST OF AUGUST SPEECH AT CONCORD, MASS.

Forgive me, fellow-citizens, if I own to you, that in the last few days that my attention has been occupied with this history, I have not been able to read a page of it, without the most painful comparisons. Whilst I have read of England, I have thought of New England. Whilst I have meditated in my solitary walks on the magninimity of the English Bench and Senate, reaching out the benefit of the law to the most helpless citizen in her world-wide realm, I have found myself oppressed by other thoughts. As I have walked in the pastures and along the edge of woods, I could not keep my imagination on those agreeable figures, for other images that intruded on me. I could not see the great vision of the patriots and senators who have adopted the slave's cause:—they turned their backs on me. No: I see other pictures—of mean men: I see very poor, very ill-clothed, very ignorant men, not surrounded by happy friends—to be plain,—poor black men of obscure employment as mariners, cooks, or stewards, in ships, yet citizens of this our Commonwealth of Massachusetts,—freeborn as we,—whom the slave-laws of the States of South Carolina, Georgia, and Louisiana, have arrested in the vessels in which they visited those ports, and shut up in jails so long as the vessel remained in port, with the stringent addition, that if the shipmaster fails to pay the costs of this official arrest, and the board in jail, these citizens are to be sold for slaves, to pay that expense. This man, these men, I see, and no law to save them. Fellow-citizens, this crime will not be hushed up any longer. I have learned that a citizen of Nantucket, walking in New Orleans, found a freeborn citizen of Nantucket, a man, too, of great personal worth, and, as it happened, very dear to him, as having saved his own life, working chained in the streets of that city, kidnapped by such a process as this. In the sleep of the laws, the private interference of two excellent citizens of Boston has, I have ascertained, rescued several natives of this State from these southern prisons. Gentlemen, I thought the deck of a Massachusetts ship was as much the territory of Massachusetts, as the floor on which we stand. It should be as sacred as the temple of God. The poorest fishing-smack, that floats under the shadow of an iceberg in the northern seas, or hunts the whale in the southern ocean, should be encompassed by her laws with comfort and protection, as much as within the arms of Cape Ann and Cape Cod. And this kidnapping is suffered within our own land and federation, whilst the fourth article of the Constitution of the United States ordains in terms, that, "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States." If such a damnable outrage can be committed on the person of a citizen with impunity, let the Governor of the State break the broad seal of the State; he hears the sword in vain. The Governor of Massachusetts is a trifler: the State-house in Boston is a play-house: the General Court is a dishonored body: if they make laws they cannot execute. The great-hearted Puritans have left no posterity. The rich men may walk in State street, but they walk without honor; and the farmers may brag their democracy in the country, but they are disgraced men. If the State has no power to defend its own people, in its own shipping, because it has delegated that power to the Federal Government, has it no representation in the Federal Government? Are those men dumb? I am no lawyer, and cannot indicate the forms applicable to the case, but here is something which transcends all forms. Let the Senators and Representatives of the State, containing a population of a million of freemen, go in a body before the Congress, and say, that they have a demand to make on them so imperative, that all functions of Government must stop, until it is satisfied. If ordinary legislation cannot reach it, then extraordinary must be applied. The Constitution should instruct the President to send to those ports of Charleston, Savannah, and New Orleans, such orders and such force, as should release, forthwith, all such citizens of Massachusetts as were holden in prison without the allegation of any crime, and should set on foot the strictest inquisition to discover where such persons, brought into slavery by these local laws, at any time heretofore, may now be. That first;—and then, let order be taken to indemnify all such as have been incarcerated. As for dangers to the Union, from such demands!—the Union is already at an end, when the first citizen of Massachusetts is thus outraged. Is it an union and covenant in which the State of Massachusetts agrees to be imprisoned, and the State of Carolina to imprison? Gentlemen, I am loath to say harsh things, and perhaps I know too little of politics for the smallest weight to attach to any censure of mine,—but I am at a loss how to characterize the tameness and silence of the two Senators and the ten Representatives of the State at Washington. To what purpose, have we clothed each of those Representatives with the power of seventy thousand persons, and each Senator with near half a million, if they are to sit dumb at their desks, and see their constituents captured and sold;—perhaps to gentlemen sitting by them in the hall? There is a scandalous rumor that has been swelling louder of late years,—perhaps it is wholly false,—that members are bullied into silence by southern gentlemen. It is so easy to omit to speak, or even to absent when delicate things are to be handled. I may as well say, what all men feel, that whilst our very amiable and very innocent Representatives and Senators at Washington, are accomplished lawyers and merchants, and very eloquent at dinners and at caucuses, there is a disastrous want of *men* from New England. I would gladly make exceptions, and you will not suffer me to forget one eloquent old man, in whose veins the blood of Massachusetts rolls, and who singly has defended the freedom of speech, and the rights of the free, against the usurpation of the slaveholder. But the reader of Congressional debates, in New England, is perplexed to see with what admirable sweetness and patience the majority of the free States, are schooled and ridden by the minority of slaveholders. What if we should send thither Representatives who were a particle less amiable and less innocent? I entreat you, Sirs, let not this stain attach, let not this misery accumulate any longer. If the managers of our political parties are too prudent and too cold;—if, most unhappily, the ambitious class of young men and political men have found out, that these neglected victims are poor and without weight; that they have no graceful hospitalities to offer; no valuable business to throw into any man's hands, no strong vote to cast at the elections; and therefore may with impunity be left in their chains or to the chance of chains, then let the citizens in their primitive capacity take up their cause on this very ground, and say to the Government of the State, and of the Union, that Government exists to defend the weak and the poor and the injured party; the rich and the strong can better take care of themselves. And as an omen and assurance of success, I point you to the bright example which England set you, on this day, ten years ago.

From the Liberator.

LETTER FROM GEORGE THOMPSON.

GLASGOW, August 1st, 1844.

My Dear Garrison: I forward you on the other side, in an attested form, a resolution passed by the Emancipation Society of this city, at a meeting attended by between two thousand and three thousand persons. Its adoption was unanimous and enthusiastic. You, I know, will lose no time in giving it publicity; and it is my earnest hope that it will be copied into every Anti-Slavery paper in the United States. Let those whose zeal in the cause of humanity has brought them to a dungeon, be assured, that though, through the iniquity of your slave system, and the consequent cruelty of your laws, they are doomed to the fate of felons, they have our sincere sympathy in their sufferings; and that we admire at once their courage and their benevolence. I trust the example of Glasgow will be followed throughout the Kingdom. Our hearts are with you in your struggle, and our confidence strong, that your labors will ultimately be crowned with success.

Yours, affectionately,
GEO. THOMPSON.

William Lloyd Garrison, Boston, U. S.

IMPRISONMENT OF AMERICAN ABOLITIONISTS FOR AIDING THE ESCAPE OF FUGITIVE SLAVES.

At the annual meeting of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, held in the City Hall, Glasgow, August 1st, 1844, the Rev. William Anderson in the Chair: It was moved by GEORGE THOMPSON, and carried by acclamation, the entire audience rising to express their heartfelt concurrence in the resolution,

That, we cordially sympathize with CHARLES T. TORREY, an American Abolitionist, recently arrested, and at present in prison in the city of Baltimore, on a charge of assisting slaves to escape from their masters in the State of Virginia; and who, if the charge be proved, will incur the penalty of imprisonment for life; and that we also sincerely and deeply sympathize with three other American Abolitionists, who are now undergoing a sentence of twelve years imprisonment on a similar charge, in the State of Missouri; and that we denounce the law under which they have been thus treated, as contrary to the laws of God, and deserving of the loud condemnation, and undisguised abhorrence of the Christian World. WM. ANDERSON, *Chairman.*

JOHN MURRAY,
WM. SMEAL,
Secretaries of the Glasgow Emancipation Society.
GLASGOW, August 1st, 1844.

From the Courier and Enquirer.

SOUTHERN TACTICS, AND NORTHERN DEMOCRACY.

Poor Northern Democracy! Injured,—insulted,—out-generaled, and ridiculed Democracy! You *have* virtues, patience and humility, let who dares deny you. Plant yourselves boldly on that platform, and defy your enemies. They may prove you dolts,—asses, doughfaces, and all that. No matter. Do not try to defend weak points. Your enemies may, and probably will, prove that you are asses. Challenge them triumphantly to show a flaw in your tempers. They will call you dolts without spirit, doughfaces without pride, honor, or self-respect. Say to them you are no Bashan Bulls—that you *do* glory in a sweet behaviour, and a pliant loyalty to the usages.

Poor Democracy! What a pretty figure you cut at Baltimore. You stood up in that Convention with the strength in your own hands. How did you use it? Like lubberly lobsters, you got first grossly and gratuitously insulted, and then you got your lesson! You pocketed the insult and bowed to your masters. Those masters did not affect the faintest disguise. They first laughed,—fairly,—openly, and broadly, at your long ears, and then placed their panniers on your backs, and set your faces homewards. They did not deem you *worth* a disguise. Political Gibeonites—hewers of wood—white niggers, whose greatest want was spirited and intelligent masters—they regarded you. Your chivalrous Butler! Glorious representative for honest men. Your Southern brothers! How they must have chuckled. This Butler—they said—this "babe of grace" attempts to play brag!!! And with *us!!* with *us!!!* Why, he might hold the pack and we would beat him—beat him shamefully. How true. How well they knew their man. I never will—said Butler—surrender Van Buren. This was to-day—to-morrow he *did* surrender him, and handed over the Democracy of New-York like a herd of scaly sheep or cattle, to be driven to the South Carolina shambles.

Glorious Butler! Patient Democracy! Gentle Democracy! Thou feelest Texas gripes—tariff spasms, Van Buren heartburns. Thou art *not* well at ease—those lugubrious eye rollings—those St. Vitus' twitchings—those hands pressed on thy stomach proclaim it. But thy family physicians—have they not given thee wholesome medicines? Ha!!—the labels!!—look at the labels! Mexican Spoliations, and Repeal of the Tariff!! Extra Constitutional Expansions of Slavery! Van Buren Extinction! Calhoun Supremacy! What! Thou thinkest them not good. Nonsense. Who should know as well as thy Doctors? Keep in the strings there—move on—move on. Gentle Democracy! Patient Democracy!

Thy creed is now told in McDuffie Speeches, and Barnwell Resolutions. Thy Southern brethren treat thee considerately. The sacrifice of thy Van Buren made a sort of Indian dog-feast—wherein was much cackling, whooping, and hearty merriment. Thyselves proclaimed in McDuffie harangues in Virginia as constituting two classes—idle itinerant aristocrats and servile beggars—but thy idols—thy great men. They fare worse still. Thy Jacksons, thy Wrights, and thy Bentons. That venerable Jackson that did in his vigor so nobly bang the Britons at New Orleans—now in his decrepid imbecility made to enact dog-whipper—to welt the backs of lagging or erratic Democrats. Crack—crack—crack, comes his lash upon the backs of his old friends. And for what? To bring them into the train of that Calhoun, and that McDuffie, he once ordered the Marshal of the District of Columbia to arrest, on the first overt act in South Carolina, as traitors. Men that he once swore that by ... . they should, before they died in their beds—feel rough and stringent hemp. And Benton—who as a mother guards her first born, nursed the fame of the old soldier—and Wright, whose stalwart arm through his whole career sustained him so firmly and so well—what cheer for them?

They have resolved to vote against the Annexation of Texas. As *gentlemen*, merely, it would be supposed that they were to go by a conscience, and a judgment, on a question like this. Not so; they were to go by the dog-whip. Old Jackson was on their road flourishing his dog-whip, and thus predenouncing them, "Who comes this road is a traitor." Arm-in-arm, with steady step, Benton and Wright approached, and placed trembling old Jackson one side, and went on their way—it is to be hoped rejoicing. The angry crackings of the old man's dog-whip did certainly accompany them a long way in the rear.

Think of this! Benton and Wright—men! Senators!—men of fifty-five years of age or over—men grown gray in the Senate—to be ruled by the dog-whip.

Thou likest all this, gentle Democracy? Yes; bamboozled—overreached and ridiculed in the Convention—thy Van Buren crushed and contemned—thy Benton and Wright mortified and humiliated before the world—thyselves pronounced by thy political masters, servile beggars and worthless aristocrats—thy old Jackson hauled out of seclusion on the verge of the grave, and in the hands of his old enemies and thy new masters—made to enact toothless tiger and ignominious buffoon—blind old Sampson in the hands of nullifying Philistines brought up to make *sport*—quite dead now, politically speaking—defunct wholly—and yet brought out and set down in the midst of Texas land-jobbers, and made to roll his old eyes—toss his arms—and grin ghastly under Calhoun galvanism to frighten his old friends; McDuffie and Calhoun in the back-ground supplying electricity. Funny!—is it not, Democracy of New-York? Rich! Huzza for Polk and Dallas! Gentle Democracy—droll—lively fellows—spirited—noble—chivalrous Democracy!

But in truth, thy company is not altogether pleasant. So much thou wilt confess. But thou hast great ends. Thou must defeat Clay. Is Clay thy worst enemy, then? Has *he* betrayed—bamboozled and insulted thee?—or have his friends done so? No—but his principles! Ah! his principles! Yes, thou likest thine own better. Those rolling eyes—those cramps and twitchings speak plainly. Thou dost like them. Thou likest them well. Yes: Clay must be defeated. Thy Texas spasms—thy Tariff gripes—thy Van Buren heartburns—they *are* good: their authors are good. Yes: Clay must be defeated. Thou hast principles. Thy Polk and thy spasms. Wilt thou not have them to thyselves? Gentle—spirited—pleasant—noble Democracy. * * * *.—*Mohawk.*

From the Liberty Courier.

ADDRESS OF THE NEW-YORK YEARLY MEETING OF FRIENDS.

[COPIED BY REQUEST.]

A number of the "Friend" was placed in my hand a few days ago by a goodly Quaker lady, with an earnest request that I would read an address of the New York-Yearly Meeting of Friends to the people of the United States, on the subject of Slavery, which it contained. I found, after giving it a tolerably careful perusal, to be what would have passed eight or ten years ago for a good anti-slavery document. It contains no new view of the subject, how ever; no argument but what has been reiterated a thousand and one times in the various Anti-Slavery papers. It refers to the example of Washington, and quotes the oft-quoted Anti-Slavery passages from Jefferson's notes on Virginia. It also quotes from William Pinckney, of Maryland. But the strong reliance these Friends place in the sayings of a few great men, now no more, to prove Slavery to be wrong; but who knew not half of what thousands do now of the multifarious evils of this execrable system is, not a fault peculiar to them: Abolitionists have erred much in this respect. Does the condemnation Slavery received from these great men make it wrong? Would their approval have made it right? I am sick of these eternal quotations from great men. Why not stand up in the full stature of manhood, and speak out fearlessly your own convictions, and not as the mere effigy of some departed brother no better than yourselves. He did his work in his day, do yours now, and you will surpass him. Slavery would have been as it is now, a damning sin against God and man, though a Washington, a Jefferson, a Paul, a Moses, or even the lovely Jesus himself had approved and practised it.

The document is undoubtedly an anti-slavery one, sincerely so. But the greatest objection to it is, that it comes too late. Whilst the Abolitionists had to endure every species of injury that a corrupt Church and State could inflict upon them, withstanding with a martyr spirit for many years a storm of the most relentless, and unmanly opposition; the Society of Friends, professing to "bear a faithful testimony against Slavery," have either looked upon the conflict which is now waging between Liberty and despotism with a cold and heartless apathy, or have joined with active zeal the most unmanly and ungodly enemy truth ever had to encounter. Whilst slaveholders were offering large rewards for the heads of many prominent Anti-Slavery men, the Society of Friends were receiving in the "quiet" (!) the adulation of these same slaveholders, for their entire exemption from abolition principles. Whilst Abolitionists were stoned, egged, tarred and feathered, and excluded, with rare exceptions, from the ordinary means of access to the people; the Society of Friends, if they did not become actual participants in these mobocratic proceedings, yet, with here and there an honorable exception, refused the use of their meeting-houses to the few who wished to meet in Christ's name, to plead the cause of the slave. The little thirty by twenty house, belonging to the people within sight of where I am now writing, has been more than once refused for this purpose. I should entertain no hope that it could be obtained at this day for the most eloquent and pious Anti-Slavery lecturer in the United States.

It strikes me as somewhat surprising that the Society of Friends should have manifested, and should still continue to manifest, so much hostility to the abolition cause, while there is such identity of feeling between them and the Abolitionists, as this address would seem to indicate. It seems to me that it would have appeared more natural for them to have sympathized with the Abolitionists, and as far as possible, consistently with their peculiar religious views, lent them approving council, and a helping hand. But it has been said we agree with you respecting the sinfulness and oppressive nature of slavery, but your harsh

and that it cannot be sacrificed without his wrath,' there is an additional and solemn reason for urging legislation upon the subject."

But to go with the Abolitionists would not be in accordance with the advice so frequently administered by their most prominent men and women, "keep out of the mixture, keep in the quiet." A Friend may not "mix with the world," to promote an important and acknowledged good, but may mix with others as much as he pleases to transact matters at least, of doubtful propriety, as trade, commerce, &c. A Friend must not meet with his fellow-men to plead the cause of the poor, and lift the burden from off the oppressed, but may, without any violation of his principles, meet and co-operate with the worst of men, in a bank, or mercantile establishment, to *defraud* the poor, and heap additional burdens on the oppressed. The praying and lecturing of the Abolitionists, are shocking to a people so prone to "quiet," but the bustle of a commercial counting room, the chink of dollars, the rattling of railroad cars, and the vociferous clamors of Bank advocates, is sweet lulling music to their ears. It is difficult to conceive how we can characterize this objection to abolitionism, under a more appropriate term than that of hypocrisy.

But after all, I am pleased with the address, and hope you will publish it. It is hoped that the Society will henceforth assume a new attitude towards the Abolitionists. When they shall have thrown away their prejudices, and adopted the sentiments of this address, they will readily go hand in hand with the Abolitionists in the great work of undoing the heavy burdens, and letting the oppressed go free.

MORAL COURAGE GREATER THAN MILITARY PROWESS.—The sentiment that he that ruleth his spirit, is better than he that taketh a city, had a sublime illustration in Luther's experience at the Diet of Worms. The Reformer was in a crowd, advancing to make his appearance before the Emperor and the assembled princes, to answer to the charge of having turned the world upside down, by attacking the errors of Popery. As he drew near the door, a valiant knight, George Freundsbury, who four years afterwards, by his prowess, decided the famous battle, in which the King of France was made a prisoner, met him. This old general touched Luther upon his shoulder, and shaking his head, blanched with many battles, said kindly: "My poor monk, my poor monk, thou hast a march and a struggle to go through, such as neither I nor any other captains have seen in our most bloody battles. But if thy cause be just, and thou art sure of it, go forward in God's name, and fear nothing. He will not forsake thee." Here a martial spirit confessed its inferiority to the courage of the soul,—the courage of the man who dares to act in the fear of God.—*Puritan.*

Communications.

LETTER FROM S. SWAIN, Jr.

PHILADELPHIA, 9th mo. 2d. 1844.

Friend Gay:—I was much pleased with a little excursion I took yesterday, in company with some friends, to attend an Anti-Slavery meeting, held at Byberry, in this County. When we arrived we found Frederic Douglas already in possession of the floor. He was relating his experience in the galling atrocities of Slavery, which he did in a masterly manner, taking occasion to digress frequently into generalities, and to discuss principles that were suggested by the operation of detailed evil. He proved himself a "swift witness" against the system, as he blended the narration of facts with appeals to correct principle—as he placed side by side the deformity of oppression, and the full beauty of freedom. Fairly did he expose the daring hypocrisy of Southern and Northern teachers of religion, and the loathsome rottenness of that religious Church that covered the black abominations of Slavery with its silken robes of *silence* and *caution*. His former condition as a slave—his living contradiction of the libel, that the negro is an inferior race—the diabolically uncertain tenure by which he holds his present identity with the broad brotherhood of man, and his kind intercourse with congenial hearts, which is a spiritual bread to the sensitive soul,—all contributed to burn into the hearts of his hearers his well-told story of wrongs.

After Frederic closed, C. L. Remond addressed the meeting. He confined his remarks to a definition of our cause, which was exceedingly well-timed and appropriate to its latitude. Friend Remond is a finished orator, and his eloquent and classic speech, as well as his gentlemanly bearing won the serious attention, and admiration of the respectable audience. Admirably suited to go hand in hand are these accomplished specimens of the negro race. No one can picture more vividly the woes of "Slavery as it is"—the blasting and damning influence it exerts on the master and his victim, than Douglas, while few can more accurately portray its effects on our national character, and the sacred duty of Northern freemen, in regard to it, than Remond. Surely it is a wise Providence that has raised them up, with capabilities and acquirements, to toil like a second Moses and Aaron for the deliverance of their people.

Remond having accidentally used the phrase, "Bonapartian zeal, and Bonapartian determination," in the conclusion of his remarks, in a figurative way, our beloved and highly devoted friend, Lucretia Mott, who has once again gladdened our gathered counsels and meetings with her presence and her wisdom, took occasion to explain to those who might misunderstand the meaning of the expression, the peaceful and persuasive character of our measures. After a few welcome and pertinent remarks of this nature, and a slight glance at the accelerated progress of our cause, and the abundant reason we had for a growing hope, the meeting quietly dispersed.

I could but contrast the meeting yesterday with the first one of the kind I attended there, some six years since. The meeting was then held in an upper room of a carriage-maker's small shop, and embraced about fifteen or twenty persons, who were addressed, amid disturbance and insult by my brother. The old steps by which we ascended were broken purposely with a great crash, and a vulgar and coarse conversation was kept up outside the house. On our return home we were assailed with stones and stony epithets. While our last was a gathering of some three or four hundred, and held without molestation in Friends' Meeting-house—a minority of those having it in charge taking the responsibility, on account of the neighboring school-house being too small to hold those assembled. This fact is exceedingly encouraging. Byberry is one of our strongholds of "sectarian Quakerism." It is a rich portion of Philadelphia county, settled principally by Friends, who have grown fat and unchartiable on their abundant harvests. The grave reverence they have cherished, under the ministry of the gifted John Comly for "keeping in the quiet," has made them almost afraid of their own voices. Their silence, though too dead to be broken by the groans of the bondman, is sometimes pierced by the ring of the "almighty dollar." Though they "discourage" singing, and light conversation is "guarded against," *its* magic melody is drunk with a favoring smile. Though this has heretofore been the character of this place, it has now some noble exceptions—a leaven of redeemed spirits—

> "A glorious remnant yet
> Whose lips are wet at Freedom's fountain,
> The coming of whose welcome feet
> Are beautiful upon our mountains!
> Those who the gospel tidings bring
> Of liberty and love forever,
> Whose joy is one abiding spring
> Whose peace is as a gentle river!"

As Whittier says of New England's pioneers; and there is great hope that the seed they sow in meekness will be raised to power,—that their "living coals of truth," which they scatter abroad will consume the prejudices of our enemies, and light their steps to the battle of Liberty.

Thine for the slave,
S. SWAIN, Jr.

THE DISUNION RESOLUTION.

MY DEAR GAY.—Please allow a place in your Standard for the following article from my brother. His remarks extend to a considerable length, or I might say a few words myself. I will merely remark that I agree with the writer almost entirely. I still consider myself *bound, by my duty to God, and to the slave*, to use moral suasion first, and political action afterwards. Moreover, believing as I do, that it was political action that *finally* produced the British West India Emancipation, I look to political action (as manifested by voting for truly Anti-Slavery men to go into our councils) as one of the greatest sources of hope to the slave in this country.

Ever most faithfully, yours, H. I. B.

To the Editors of the Anti-Slavery Standard:

Permit me, through your columns, to speak a few words upon the subject of the "Disunion Resolution" that has lately been passed by the American Anti-Slavery Society.

The ground taken in this resolution is this—that inasmuch as the Constitution of the United States offers certain guarantees to slaveholders, and the support of Slavery, therefore Abolitionists, believing Slavery and slaveholding to be a grievous wrong, to be *consistent*, cannot voluntarily do anything to support that Constitution, directly or indirectly. In other words, the principle contained in the resolution is this—*No man can voluntarily engage to support a measure or compact which he knows or sees has any evil in it.* The position is not taken that, as Christians we have no right to establish or support any human form of government whatever, and that therefore no Christian Abolitionist can support this Constitution; but the right or power to establish and support *some* form of human government, is assumed as existing. The resolution implies the right and power of the people of the United States to frame some form of government for themselves, and assents that in the exercise of such power, such a Constitution has been framed as no Abolitionist, claiming to be consistent, can support.

Most persons will admit that the Constitution of the United States was calculated and intended to effect more general good than evil. Such was undoubtedly the aim and purpose of many of the great and good men who framed it. But at the same time, all must admit, that along with great advances in behalf of human happiness and freedom, there are many, very many blemishes, which, though they may have been intended by the founders as *blemishes only*, have now become deadly wounds. Cannot a man rightly yield support to a form of government or compact, which, along with many blessings and much good, *permits* or *even* assists in the perpetration of some wrong? It seems to me that he can.

There never was, and I see no reason to believe that there ever will be, on this earth, either a perfectly good, or a wholly bad man. There are very good, and very bad men, as we call them; but none in which either virtue or vice is *supreme* in every thought, word, and action. No man was ever so good that it could be said of him on his death-bed, (otherwise than merely in comparison with other men,) "Mark the *perfect* man, and the upright." Neither is there any man so wholly depraved but that the voice of *kindness and love* will reach even him.

But if a man's character cannot be either perfectly good, or wholly bad, we do wrong to expect in his works either perfection, or absolute and entire wrong. An imperfect creature's work must necessarily be imperfection. It would be miraculous were it otherwise. What science, art, or trade, has ever yet been brought to perfection? What poet (I speak only of *true* poets) ever yet considered his conception perfect? Have they not all imagined something higher, or nobler, or purer than any thing they had yet expressed? Is there any fixed point, short of the attributes and power of God, which is *perfection?* Is there any man existing who really feels that by *any* effort he can become perfect, even as his Father in Heaven is perfect? If we say that we have no sin, we *deceive* ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

All the acts of man, therefore, must necessarily be imperfect, as being the productions of an imperfect creature. We may properly say we *know*, "a priori," that no man's act can produce, or be wholly good. His object and aim *may* be good, may be very high and noble—but even if his aim *be* at perfection, his arrow will fall far short of the mark. Now if a man, being imperfect, resolves that he will never do or support anything but what is absolute perfection, where in this world will he find work to do or support? He *knows* that he himself can neither do a *perfect* action, nor propose a perfect course of conduct for others to follow—but can only *approximate* to perfection; and he also knows that other men can no more reach perfection than he. Can he do nothing? Because he is afraid of doing some wrong, is he to hesitate about doing a much greater good? Is he, like the slothful servant, to bury his talent in the earth?

I disagree with the resolution of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and think its tendency bad. Cannot I rightfully do anything to support the Anti-Slavery Standard and Liberator, the editors of both of which papers support this resolution, *totis viribus*? Some parts of the Old Testament, to persons in certain states of mind, appear to me to be decidedly injurious, in point of their morality. Shall I, therefore, refuse to assist in its distribution or circulation? If I think the perusal of the Old Testament, and of these publications, is productive of an infinitely greater good than harm, am I not doing right in perusing or circulating them? It seems to me that I am.

But if this principle contended for, be true, how can I, or any one else, knowing beforehand that the effect of some passages of the Old Testament, and of the discussions in these publications is bad, do anything to circulate either of them? If I lay any claim to consistency, must I not resolve to have no union or connection with either of them, and attempt to set public opinion against them, in order that they may be overthrown? To be consistent, I must stifle, along with the one grain of error, the two grains of truth. I must destroy the wheat with the chaff.

The Constitution of the United States, as well as every other human system of government which ever has existed—which now exists—or hereafter will exist—is, and must necessarily be, imperfect—is, and must necessarily be a mixture of good and evil. Now, if the right to form such Governments is conceded to mankind, and if, from the very nature of man, they must all be more or less evil, the *duty* or *right* to *support*, would seem necessarily to follow from the *right* to *frame such Governments*. Unless, therefore, Abolitionists who claim to be consistent are willing to become Non-Resistants—are willing to hold and maintain the doctrine that man has no right to establish any kind of Government, whatever, they must, it seems to me, admit man's right to set up a frame of government, of some sort or other; and if they admit this right, they must also admit the *right* and *duty*, to *support* some such form of government:—and inasmuch as we know beforehand, as clearly as if the plan were written out at length, that mankind *cannot* form any Government without an admixture of evil in its composition—they must admit the right and duty to support a Government which they know has an admixture of evil in its composition. Such seems to be the necessary result.

I agree with "consistent" Abolitionists, that there are clauses in the Constitution which are most infamous; which are disgraceful to us as a nation claiming to be republican. But at the same time *knowing* as I do, that no other government at present existing is one whit better, except it may be in some few particulars, and in some points they are all far behind our Constitution—and *knowing*, also, that were the task of framing a Constitution which would have no admixture of evil imposed on the American Anti-Slavery Society, or the supporters of this resolution, such a Constitution could not possibly be framed by them—and knowing, also, that there is a power which can amend our Constitution in its defective parts, (*not being a Non-Resistant myself,*) and believing in the propriety and feasibility of some human form of government, I cannot bring myself to believe in, or support this resolution, and I hope that I am right in engaging to support the Constitution.

As an Abolitionist—as one who has for some time past been in favor of Immediate Emancipation, as being both just and expedient, and as one who hopes to act "consistently" in this belief, I dissent from the spirit and principle of this resolution. Having avoided all connection as a *member*, with Anti-Slavery Societies, I have no right to *protest* against its passage. But as I do not wish either to be, or to be considered "*a tyrant, or the abettor of tyrants,*" (one or the other of which I *must* be according to the address of the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, as being one who opposes this resolution,) I have taken this mode of stating some of my reasons against it.

The spirit is a pharasaical one. "Depart from me, for I am holier than thou," is the *real*, though not the actual language used by the supporters of this resolution towards the slaveholders. Who are the supporters of this resolution? weak, fallible, sinning men, as weak, as fallible, and it may be as sinful, and even more sinful, than the slaveholders. Shall we, who are such men, resolve to have "no union with slaveholders, either religious or political?" Shall we separate from them "to clear our skirts of innocent blood;—to give the oppressor no countenance to signify our abhorrence of injustice or cruelty—to testify against an ungodly compact—to cease striking hands with thieves, and consenting with adulterers," or for any other purpose; or shall we not rather treat the slaveholders as our brethren, whose good feelings are not dead, but only sleeping—who are not so very unlike what we ourselves might have been, had we been exposed to the same influences which have surrounded them—as men whose hearts can be reached, if we treat them as we ourselves would like to be treated—with unvarying kindness and charity.

"Perfect was before God, and perfect is Love and Love only—
"Lovest thou God as thou oughtest, then lovest thou likewise thy brethren:
"*One* is the sun in heaven, and *one, only one* is Love also.
"Bears not each human figure, the God-like stamp on his forehead?
"Readest thou not in his face thine origin? Is he not sailing,
"Lost like thyself, on an ocean unknown—and is he not guided
"By the same stars that guide thee? * * *
* * * * * *
"Think of thy brother no ill, but throw a veil over his failings.
"Guide the erring aright: for the good the heavenly shepherd
"Took the lost lambin his arms, and bore it back to its mother.

But let us look at *some* of the results to which the principle of this resolution carries us.

We cannot, it is said, as "consistent" Abolitionists, vote, or do anything to support the Government, State or National. We cannot, therefore, *petition* the Government, or its members, *as à Government*, to induce it to pass any legislative measure, to do any act *as a Government*. Because, by asking a Government to do an act, we recognize its power to do it. All we can do is to petition the members of a Government, as *individuals*, to do acts *as private individuals merely*. It is wrong for us to ask Congress to recommend an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, abolishing all its slavery features.

Neither can we be holders of Government or State, or city stock, if we wish to be consistent, since by holding such stock we directly contribute to the support of Government, and receive from it interest for our loans. If we cannot hold the stock of the *Government*, neither can we hold the stock of any bank, insurance company, railroad, manufacturing, or any other corporation *established by authority of Government*, because, by becoming a shareholder in any one of these companies, we act under the authority of the Government—neither can we, having invested our property in notes of individuals, on failure of payment, commence a suit to recover back our money, because we thereby avail ourselves of the laws of a society we think it wrong to support, andrecognize the jurisdiction of the Court over our person and our cause. But if we admit the jurisdiction of the *Court* or the *agent*, we also admit the power and right of the Government, or *Constituent*.

The correctness of this latter position has, however, been denied by the Liberator, and by Mr. Phillips in his reply to the writer of the article entitled, "The No-Voting Theory." But notwithstanding this denial, I agree with the writer of the latter article. The Liberator says: "The withdrawing Abolitionist stands on the same footing as an alien who sues in our Courts." Mr. Phillips says: "The Liberator I think is right, in saying that an alien does not recognize the rightfulness of a Government, by suing under it, and I challenge our friend to produce any respectable writer on law, who maintains the contrary."

As I am not the "friend" referred to, I do not feel called upon to take up the challenge, but with all deference, I submit that nothing can be stated which is a clearer principle of law and common sense, than that a party plaintiff *does recognize* the *authority* and *jurisdiction* of the tribunal which he appeals to for redress of his wrongs. A party who is wronged states his grievance to a Court, as to a party having *power* to *redress* it, and names the person in the wrong, and requests that the Court will compel his attendance before them, and administer right and justice in the premises. It is in the power of the *defendant* of the party who is brought before the Court, *against his will*, to deny the jurisdiction of the Court, by a plea in abatement; but what lawyer ever heard of a *plaintiff* saying to the Court, "True it is, your Honors, I have requested you to judge my case, and if you think proper so to do, to decide that I am in the wrong, but at the same time I think you have no power or jurisdiction over the matter at all." I challenge Mr. Phillips to produce any respectable writer on law, who maintains that a plaintiff (be he an alien, or citizen, or seceding Abolitionist,) can legally take such objection to the jurisdiction of the Court he resorts to.

A distinction, however seems to be taken by Mr. Phillips, between a recognition of the power or jurisdiction of a court, and a recognition of the *rightfulness* of such power or jurisdiction. He seems to contend that I may appeal to a person who has wrongfully obtained, or who is wrongfully holding power, and request him to use it in my redress, and thereby do nothing incompatible with my duty of consistency, or do nothing thereby to recognize the *rightfulness* of his power—that I simply, by such appeal, recognize his *power*. Suppose this to be the case, and that the seceding Abolitionist, by suing, only recognize the *ability* or *power*, but not the *rightful* power of the Court to grant redress—is he any more consistent under this view of the case?

As a seceding Abolitionist, I say *I* cannot rightfully hold the office of Judge, or Sheriff, or Marshal, under the Constitution, neither can I vote or do any other thing to put any one else in either of those positions; for I can not rightfully authorize or empower *another* to do an act which I cannot rightfully do myself. But if I cannot rightfully *make another* a Judge, or Marshal, or Sheriff, how can I rightfully ask another, being a Judge, or Marshal or Sheriff, to do any act by virtue of his office? I cannot rightfully appoint a man to an office—how can I rightfully ask him when appointed, to do any of its duties? I come to the conclusion that *I* cannot rightfully hold an office, or discharge its duties. Can I rightfully ask any one else to hold it, or discharge any of its duties?

It seems to me that I am right, therefore, in saying that "consistent" Abolitionists must also resolve not to sue in the Courts, and in case they are sued, not to defend themselves, since they ought not to avail themselves of the laws of a country, the Governmentof which they cannot rightfully uphold, and which they consider "cemented with blood"—and because they ought not to ask of any one else the performance of official duties which they consider it to be wrong to do themselves.

Neither can we, if we wish to be consistent, pay any taxes to support the Government; because, if we cannot rightfully by our *vote* support it, neither can we rightfully do anything else which will directly tend to the same result. If we cannot rightfully support the Government in any one way, neither can we in another.

This position is also denied by Mr. Phillips. I *agree* with him that there is no distinction between voluntarily paying taxes and letting Government collect them by force—but not for the reason which he assigns, viz:—that a tax is an imposition to which Government does not ask the *assent* of the individual. True it is that societies do not permit aliens and women to *vote*, and therefore they cannot, in *one* sense, be said to *assent* to the tax imposed on them, or voluntarily to assist in taxing themselves through representatives chosen by themselves.

But it seems to me, that every *resident*, whether he be a "non-voter, alien, or woman," (the example given by Mr. Phillips,) *by the mere fact of residence*, and reaping, necessarily thereby, the advantage of the protection afforded him in person and property by society, agree to do all such acts, for the support of such society, which its laws impose on persons in his position. "This is a principle of justice, universally adopted." (2 Kent's Comment. 64.) If a foreigner comes here to trade, is there not immediately implied an agreement between him and society, by the terms of which he agrees to do nothing to injure the society, or infringe upon its laws, and to do everything for its support, which at the time of his arrival here, its laws impose on aliens? Such seems to me to be clearly the case. Do we not punish foreigners residing here who break our laws? Do we ever hear that these foreigners deny the justice of their punishment on account of their alienage? Society has, and constantly exercises, the right of excluding from its limits individuals whose character or sentiments it considers dangerous. If, instead of excluding them, suppose it should simply say in its laws, "All residents, whether non-voters, aliens, or women, shall be taxed, they shall pay such a sum of money towards the support of Government." It is equivalent to saying to such persons—these are the conditions or terms upon which you have our permission to reside here,—the terms on which we will afford you protection. Now, if a non-voter, or an alien—well knowing the existence of such a law, come to such a society, and there take up his residence, does he not, by such *act, say* as directly as if he proclaimed it on the house-tops,—I know the terms on which you permit me to reside among you, and I agree to them. I will bear true faith and allegiance to your Government so long as I reside within its limits.

Such seems to me to be the legitimate inference from the simple fact of *residence*. If this be true, then we must admit Mr. Phillips's reason to be wrong, and must conclude that where the laws of a society impose a tax on *residents*, as such, whoever voluntarily becomes a resident, voluntarily agrees to pay the tax.

The above argument is, however, founded on the assumption, that society has the right to prescribe the terms upon the expressed or implied agreement to comply with which a person may reside within its limits. Mr. Phillips may, however, contend that man has an absolute and incontrollable right to live where he pleases, and that the exercise of such natural right, cannot, by any act of society, be rendered wrong. He certainly contends that he, himself, has such right in this society—this being his native place—whether he contends that he has such an absolute and incontrollable right to live elsewhere does not so clearly appear. But whether he does or does not maintain both these positions, they seem to me both to be wrong.

From such a cursory examination as I have been enabled to give the subject, I do not find it laid down any where in the works of the distinguished Jurists I have consulted, that any such absolute and inalienable rights as this exists. Chancellor Kent (2 Kent's Comment.) tells us that the absolute rights of individuals may be resolved into the right of personal security—the right of personal liberty, and the right to acquire and enjoy property. These rights, he says, have been justly considered to be natural, inherent, and inalienable. The only one of these rights, spoken of by the Chancellor, which affect the question we are considering, is the second, viz:—the right of personal liberty—and in speaking more at length of this, he states, that in England its regular consequence is said to be the right of an Englishman to abide in his own country so long as he pleases. But this right is immediately limited by annexing the qualification that society can rightfully exclude him from its limits for a breach of its laws, or can compel him to go abroad in the military or naval service of his country. And the Chancellor goes on to say, that in this country, where no Constitutional provisions are in the way, it would be in the power of the Legislatures of the States to inflict banishment as a punishment. (2 Kent's Comment. p. 33.)

It would seem, therefore, that in the opinion of Chancellor Kent, the better opinion was that even a *native citizen* possessed the right to live in the land of his birth only *subject* to the superior rights of society to dispose of his person as its own safety demanded; and (without referring to any more legal authorities) if the right of a *native born citizen* to stay in the land of his birth, is a qualified right, and subject to the superior right of society *a fortiori*, the right of an *alien* to reside in a society would also be subject to its superior right.

The right, therefore, of Mr. Phillips to stay here or to go abroad, as he pleases, are limited ones. He can enjoy neither without control, but his enjoyment of both is subject to a superior right. I cannot, therefore, say that, having a superior natural incontrollable right to remain here, society, by any act of its own, or by laying a tax on residents, cannot make my residence here *wrong*—because I have no such superior right—my right is *subject*, is *inferior* to the right of society; and if I stay here, where there is a tax on residents, I do it by the permission of society; and I impliedly agree to pay its tax, because I know that such are its terms on which I have permission to reside within its limits.

If this reasoning be true, then we must admit that, to be consistent, we must not stay here, where direct taxes are laid on us, but must leave the country. It will make no difference at all whether we *voluntarily* pay the taxes or suffer our property to be taken in satisfaction, since we have *voluntarily* and without any *necessity*, and in the exercise of no absolute incontrollable right, submitted ourselves to be taxed.

But if we stay here, and yet do everything else we can to support the Government, except vote or become a Government officer,—if we cry aloud and spare not,—say this Constitution is "a covenant with death and an agreement with hell,"—if we call heaven and earth to witness that we *separate* ourselves from the unclean thing; and yet, notwithstanding all this, to avoid trouble or inconvenience, or from any other motive, voluntarily and without necessity, pay taxes; or, by residence, impliedly *agree* to pay them,—if we can petition the Government to do a *legislative* act,—if we can *rightfully* ask a Government officer, being a Judge, or Sheriff, to aid us in getting our *money*—todo that which, with our *lips* we say it is *wrong* for us to *do* ourselves,—if we can hold Government stock, or stock of companies whose *existence* and *creation* is the act of Government,—if, notwithstanding, we can do these and the like things, can we at the same time claim the merit of doing nothing to support such a covenant with death? Where is our consistency? *Do* we, by such a course, *clear* our skirts of innocent blood,—*do* we thereby give the oppressor no countenance, signify our abhorrence of injustice and cruelty, and testify *against* an ungodly compact? Do we not, *rather*, by such a course, *voluntarily support* injustice and cruelty, and an ungodly compact? But suppose, for "consistency's" sake, we seek other shores—where shall we go? what Government can we support as beings halting nothing short of *perfection?* Must we not go to some desert island, and there attempt to establish (what *almighty* power alone can do) a *perfect* Government? Or shall we not rather, like practical acting beings who have the duty to perform of advancing the condition of man as near perfection as we can attain, put our shoulders to the wheel, and by such course of conduct towards the slaveholders as would influence us were we in their places, endeavor, by the use of human means and power, to effect the object we are all striving after?

Respectfully, yours,
WILLIAM I. BOWDITCH.

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, SEPT. 19, 1844.

Take Notice.—There is a paper published in this city, called the New-York Standard, and letters and papers intended for us, often get miscarried to that office. Our friends and correspondents will please be sure and direct to us, as the *Anti-Slavery* Standard.

JAMES G. BIRNEY.

The character and claims of a candidate for the highest office in the nation are always proper topics for public consideration and discussion. As long as strict truthfulness is observed in the statement of facts, and common sense consulted in the deduction of inferences from them, no one has a just right to complain. Especially, when a candidate is nominated by a party claiming an Anti-Slavery character, and it is maintained to be an Anti Slavery duty to vote for him, it becomes peculiarly necessary to consider the nature of his claims to the confidence and support of genuine Abolitionists. This is the position of Mr. Birney. He is placed before the country as a man deserving the suffrages of all men, and especially of all Abolitionists, by the Third Political Party. He has received at its hands the magnificent title of "THE JUST." Let us briefly glance at the pretensions of this new Aristides.

The voluntary manumission of his own slaves, is the chief, if not the only, ground, upon which the partisans of Mr. Birney rest his claims to the Presidency. Let him have all due honor for that act of justice. It is, indeed, no more than we demand of every slaveholder in the land, as his simplest duty. But in a corrupt age, and a slaveholding country,—in this land of slavery, lynch law, and repudiation,—an act of common honesty and simple justice excites a degree of observation and admiration disproportionate to its absolute merit. In these days, a man discharges his butcher's score in the self-complacent spirit of martyrdom, and pays his tailor's bill with the air of a Curtius leaping into the gulph. Though Mr. Birney and the other gentlemen, who have of late years emancipated their slaves, have done no more than their duty in thus ceasing from wickedness, they still deserve all the credit due to the performance of an act of justice under unfavorable circumstances. They have done honestly by their slaves when it was in their power to have continued to treat them dishonestly,—and that without losing their credit, either with the Church or the world. And for this they deserve high honor. But it does not necessarily follow that they deserve to be made Presidents of the United States for it. Mr. Cassius M. Clay, Dr. Wm. H. Brisbane, Mr. Secretary Palfrey, of Massachusetts, (perhaps the most honorable example of all, inasmuch as he had never derived any benefit from the labors of the hereditary slaves whom he emancipated at a great expense,) have all performed the same act of justice that Mr. Birney has done, but I do not know that they have ever been nominated to high office, on that account, or even received an honorary augmentation to their names. A man may have manumitted his slaves and yet be very far from deserving the political support of Abolitionists, however much they may appreciate and honor that action. General Scott, and the late accomplished Major Lomax, of the Army, Commodore Nicholson, of the Navy, Mr. Catesby Graham, and Mr. David Minge, of Virginia, and hundreds besides, have set their slaves free within the last half century, and have made no particular boast of it, who all deserve the respect of Abolitionists for their humanity, but who do not necessarily deserve their votes for political office. Something more than this fact must be made out to establish their claims.

A true Abolitionist believes the Anti-Slavery Enterprise to be the only earthly hope of the American slave. That enterprise consists in the united action of those who hate Slavery with a perfect hatred, and who have devoted themselves to its destruction. They move steadily onward towards their object, unmoved by sectarian biases, and uninfluenced by political predilections. They abandon neither their political nor their religious opinions by coming into the cause; but if either the party or the sect they love place itself in their way, they trample it without hesitation under their feet. They believe that nothing can be well-pleasing to God, or beneficial to man, the existence or the prosperity of which depends on the concilation or the toleration of Slavery. Their voice is as the voice of one crying in the wilderness, bidding men repent and flee from the wrath to come. They have sacrificed the approbation of the world, the good opinion of their friends, their rank in society, their consideration in the Church, their hopes of preferment, in many instances their professions and means of livelihood, and have counted it all joy to be made even as the slave, that thus they may hasten his deliverance. They ask not for the crowns of victory or the glories of the triumph;—they only claim the privilege of serving on the Forlorn-hope of Freedom's battle. The true Anti-Slavery Enterprise can never be strong in numbers; but it is mighty in influence. If the day of the peaceful and bloodless abolition of American Slavery is not gone by, it is by the uncompromising and disinterested labors of the Anti-Slavery movement, only, that it can be achieved. THAT MOVEMENT MR. BIRNEY HAS BETRAYED, AND HAS DONE WHAT HE COULD TO DESTROY. This is the complaint that the Abolitionists have against him.

I have space but for a very few of the proofs of this accusation, which might be easily made to fill a volume. The subtle spirit of sectarianism was busy from an early point of Anti-Slavery history,—endeavoring to use the movement for its own purposes,—or, failing of that object, to crush it. Mr. Birney, from the very beginning, showed that his sect was dearer to him than his humanity. The very first development of this sectarian plot was made by Mr. Birney at the New England Convention of 1835, in a series of resolutions virtually condemning the Abolitionists for their censure of the pro-slavery Church and clergy. As the conspiracy went on, it had the encouragement of Mr. Birney's sympathy, and in due time of his voice and influence. He was a member of the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society during the years 1839-40, and was a partaker in all the treacherous attacks of that body on the integrity of the movement, which are still fresh in the memory of the Abolitionists of that day. He was one of the men who took the Massachusetts Society by the throat in the spring of 1839, and, Shylock-like, demanded the instant payment of its pledge, in the hope of fixing dishonor on the brow of the pioneer society; which hope was nobly disappointed by the efforts which within a few weeks made up the full sum of $10,000,—paid to satisfy the point of honor, by men who had lost all confidence in the honesty of the Committee to which it had been pledged in an unwary hour. He was the first to propose and recommend, in March, 1839, the disgraceful "new organization" in Massachusetts,—the example to the other States; which having exhausted its vitality of spite in vainly attempting to destroy the movement it had deserted, has long since merged, everywhere, in the Third Party. At that very time, be it remembered, Mr. Birney was receiving, through the Committee of which he was a member, from the very Abolitionists whose measures he was misrepresenting, and whose characters he was attacking,* a salary equal to that of the Governor of Massachusetts! In 1840, when it had become obvious that the Old Committee could no longer keep possession of the American Society, Mr. Birney crowned his treachery by proposing THAT THE SOCIETY SHOULD BE DISSOLVED! In England, at the London Conference of 1840, whither he had been sent, chiefly at the expense of the Society, and subsequently, he assisted to his utmost ability, the hostile organization, (formed soon after he sailed,) in its lying attempts to destroy the influence of the Society which he professed to represent, and to blacken the characters of the friends he had deserted. At that Conference, too, while sitting as a delegate from the American Society, which he had sought to destroy, he used his influence and his vote, to exclude from their seats the true representatives of the Society, who arrived after the opening of the Conference!!

There are one or two particulars of the history of the Executive Committee of 1839-'40, of which Mr. Birney was a member, which are worthy of remembrance. That Committee had had entrusted to it by the Abolitionists, within the three years preceding May 1840, no less a sum than A HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS, besides many thousands in previous years. This money it had expended in various ways—in salaries, publications, &c. A large sum, not less than $20.000 had been invested in the Emancipator, the organ of the Society, and expended to make good the deficiency of subscriptions, &c. A large sum had also been invested in publications, and other bookseller's stock. As the Annual Meeting of 1840 approached, the signs of the time showed very plainly that the sceptre was about to depart from the Committee that had so long swayed it. The Society, after placing in its hands no less a sum than $47,000 in six months, (having virtually forbidden them at the previous Annual Meeting to raise more that $32,000,) and finding that this great amount was chiefly expended in attempting to destroy the auxiliary Societies that mainly furnished it, and in maligning the characters of their most devoted members, stopped the supplies, and manifested a strong determination to call their servants to a strict reckoning at the next Annual Meeting. The Committee were alarmed, and immediately took measures to dispose of the property and organ of their constituents. On the 16th of April, within less than four weeks of the Annual Meeting, the Committee, *under pretence of poverty*, conveyed the Emancipator to a Society of young men in New-York, who were in effect themselves under another name. The amount necessary to be raised to preserve the Emancipator for its rightful owners, was less than *three hundred dollars*. THE COMMITTEE AT THAT MOMENT HAD AT THEIR DISPOSAL ASSETS, STANDING IN THEIR OWN BOOKS, AT MORE THAN EIGHTEEN THOUSAND DOLLARS! At the *very same meeting* at which they thus *conveyed* away the Emancipator, because they could not raise *three hundred* dollars, they voted to appropriate THREE HUNDRED dollars, to enable MR. BIRNEY to go to England, and FIVE HUNDRED dollars to enable Mr. Stanton to make the same excursion! And the money was raised, for to England they went. The Emancipator being thus conveyed, the young gentlemen who had consented to be its receivers, subsequently transferred it to Mr. Leavitt, who has ever since been its editor, and derived his support from it. It is unnecessary to say that the Emancipator, still rightfully the property of the American Society, is the chief organ of Mr. Birney, and of his party,—if, indeed, it may not be justly considered as THE PARTY itself.

But there was other property to be disposed of—and it was managed on this wise. There was a certain sum due for salaries and expenses to Mr Birney, Mr. Stanton, and Mr. Lewis Tappan, amounting in all to *three thousand, nine hundred and ninety-five dollars, and ninety-eight cents.* ($3,995.98.) It was voted that this amount be paid to those gentlemen in publications, *at half the wholesale price.* Accordingly, they received for the amount aforesaid, ($3,995.98) property worth, *at wholesale prices*, SEVEN THOUSAND, NINE HUNDRED AND NINETY-ONE DOLLARS, NINETY-SIX CENTS. ($7,991.96)!!! All the stock on hand, after these appropriations, was conveyed to two of the Committee as trustees, to secure certain debts and liabilities, mostly to themselves, and not a syllable has been heard from them on the subject from that day to this. So when the Society came together to call its unjust stewards to account, they found themselves stripped of their organ, and of every farthing of their property, and had to begin the world anew.

Mr. Leavitt justifies this conduct of the Committee, on the ground that "IN SELLING THE EMANCIPATOR, AND IN ASSIGNING THE OTHER PROPERTY TO TRUSTEES, THEY (THE COMMITTEE,) ACTED AS OWNERS." That is to say, a Committee consisting of bankrupt merchants, salaried dependents on the Society, (as Secretaries, editor, agents, &c.) two or three fourth-rate city clergymen, and one or two colored men, (I say this not invidiously, but merely to show how small a part of this great sum the Committee could have contributed,) who had not probably, all together, contributed during those three years fifty dollars to the treasury of the Society, while they drew thousands and tens of thousands from it for their own salaries and expenses, received from their constituents A HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND dollars, in trust for the purposes of the Society, which forthwith, according to Mr. Leavitt, became THEIR OWN!! This is the only defence that has ever been attempted of their conduct, and they are certainly entitled to the full benefit of it.

I may as well state here, that among the other articles of the Society's property which that Committee had carried off with them was its CASH BOOK. They have refused to allow their successors even a glimpse of it. So that we are in entire ignorance of the disposition of the large funds placed on their hands. They may have been expended on the legitimate objects of the Society; but, for aught we know to the contrary, they may have been invested in "Up-town lots," or in *building speculations at Brooklyn.*†

Of this Committee, Mr. Birney was a prominent member. Of all these doings he was a partaker. This has

---

* This is proved by the fact that as soon as the "Old Organized" Abolitionists had thoroughly lost their confidence in that Committee, funds ceased to come into the treasury.

† I have not entered into the question of the expediency of "a" liberty party, in this article. When the present third party shall have discarded its disgraceful candidate and editors, it will be time enough to consider the abstract question. But it may not be unedifying to recall to mind the opinions of MR. BIRNEY HIMSELF, and of his principal partisans, on the subject, a year or two before his nomination.

In July, 1837, the Executive Committee of the American A. S. Society put forth a circular to the Abolitionists of the United States, signed by Messrs. JAMES G. BIRNEY, ELIZUR WRIGHT, jr. and HENRY B. STANTON, Corresponding Secretary, of which the following is an extract:

"At the last annual meeting of the American A. S. Society, the following resolution was adopted:

"Resolved, THAT WE DEPRECATE THE ORGANIZATION OF ANY ABOLITION POLITICAL PARTY," &c.

"Resolutions embodying the same idea have been passed by the New England A. S. Convention, and we believe by nearly all, if not all, the State A. S. Societies.

"The undersigned think, *that the time has come*, when the friends of the slave SHOULD ACT FULL

been his conduct towards the Anti-Slavery Enterprise, ever since it first took him up. Is he a man for Abolitionists to make a President of? Did they dismiss him from their service as a Corresponding Secretary of an Anti-Slavery Society, because they could not trust him, and will they seek to place him in the Chair of the Nation? They see how he served them when they paid him but twenty-five hundred dollars a year, do they think that twenty-five thousand will purchase better behaviour? He hath been faithless over a few things, will they, therefore, make him ruler over many? He has betrayed them upon a small temptation, do they think that he will be true to them under a great one? If so, they have bought experience, at a dear rate, to very little purpose.

Some very excellent persons have been shocked at my asserting, some time since, that in my opinion Mr. Birney is the most objectionble candidate now in the field. I said so deliberately and intelligently, and I repeat the assertion before God and all good men. Indeed, I can hardly conceive that there should be any difference of opinion on the subject among intelligent and well-informed Abolitionists. The other candidates are the open manly enemies of the Anti-Slavery movement,—Mr. Birney is the traitor in the camp. *They* defend Slavery openly, *he* attacks Anti-Slavery in the guise of friendship. Which is the most to be feared, a professed foe, or a treacherous friend? Who would not rather choose to encounter Goliath of Gath, in all his panoply, than Joab, the son of Zeruiah, who stabs into the fifth rib while he says, "Art thou in health, my brother?" Which was thought the most dangerous enemy to Revolutionary America, Sir Henry Clinton, or Benedict Arnold?

My personal acquaintance with Mr. Birney, and his confederates, is of the very slightest, and most perfunctory nature possible. I never had the smallest personal collision with him, or any of them. I have no "old grudge" to gratify. But I know facts, *which have never been denied*, and which I deem it essential to be freshly remembered, in the present state of affairs. Perhaps there is no man in the cause to whose tastes and habits such a task as I have undertaken can be more repugnant than to mine. But as the faithful servant of the American slaves, I will never hold my peace when I see men who have betrayed them once, seeking to use them again for their purposes of ambition and selfishness. I know the American Abolitionists well, and I know that there is no malice in their hearts towards these men for the injuries they have done to them. But there is a strong determination that they shall never deceive others as they have deceived them, through a cowardly or morbid love of peace on their part. For what has God given us memory, except that we may walk in the light of our own experience and that of others? To bear malice against one that has injured us, is a vice; to suffer him to betray us, a second time, is a folly; to permit him to deceive another, is a crime. A wise man ever *forgives* an injury as soon as it is committed; none but a fool ever *forgets* one.—G.

---

ber of the Committee, and defended their positions at the Annual meeting.

"It is to be supposed that some POLITICAL WOLVES will put on THE CLOTHING OF ABOLITIONISTS, and seek TO ELEVATE THEMSELVES, and manage the Anti-Slavery Organization *to suit their own purposes*. BUT THEY OUGHT TO BE MET ON THE THRESHOLD, AND STRIPPED OF THEIR DISGUISE.

☞ The best safeguard against their entrance is, for Abolitionists, while they firmly refuse to vote for a man who will not support Abolition measures, TO AVOID SETTING UP CANDIDATES OF THEIR OWN!"

Whatever may be the opinion entertained of these gentlemen in other respects, their claims to the *prophetic* character cannot well be denied, after reading the first sentence of this last extract.

PROFESSOR CLEVELAND'S LETTER.

In relating the occurrence at the Liberty Party meeting at Norristown, I meant clearly and unequivocally to state this fact, namely: That in a meeting professing to be a public political caucus, and to which *all* persons, and women especially, had been invited, certain letters were withheld from reading, because a woman was present. I used these words: "Professor Cleveland, who was the Chairman, said that he had certain letters to read to the meeting, but which he could not do, inasmuch as there were persons, or a person, present, before whom they could not be read." Mr. Cleveland declares that he "*said no such thing.*" His assertion is an impeachment of my veracity, and self-respect requires of me to acknowledge my error—and error is not always falsehood—if I have made one, or to show myself in the right, if I think I am, though it shall involve the unpleasant necessity of convicting another of having departed from the truth, in a case where he can hardly be excused on the score of ignorance or forgetfulness. A personal altercation is by no means agreeable to me, but to rest quietly under the accusation of the most contemptible of all sins, is still less so.

If I understand Mr. Cleveland's use of the term "*no such thing*," he means to deny, not only that he did not use the language attributed to him, but that he did or said nothing which could by any possibility be construed into an intention on his part of *doing the thing* wherewith I have charged him. But he does not leave me merely to imply his meaning, as he distinctly states, that he rose to read the letters he had received, with the remark, "that presuming that all present were friends of our cause, I would read a few extracts, if agreeable to the meeting." He continues "I was about to do so," when he was interrupted by Mrs. Burleigh, who proposed to retire because she was not a friend to Liberty Party, but on learning who she was, he "said at once, I hoped, by all means she would keep her seat."

Two things here are note-worthy. First, where was the necessity of a presumption that all persons present were friends of Liberty Party, before it would be expedient to read the letters? Did the letters contain matter which Liberty Party could not bear just then should be made public? Secondly, why wait till it was known that the "lady" was Mrs. Burleigh, before requesting her to remain—granting for the moment that any such request was made—? had it been "the wife of one of our country friends," would she have been entitled to less respect?

But leaving these questions, the last of which, though important in relation to the print in dispute, I have no means of positively deciding, and the first of which I can answer, but shall not now, I still maintain that my first representation was essentially true, if my means of information may be relied on,—the relation of Mrs. Burleigh herself in the Norristown meeting, and the corroborating testimony of others—Mr. Cleveland's own friends—who were present. Now I did not pretend in the stating of the fact to give the precise language used by Mr. Cleveland, in one particular connected sentence, but in the words quoted by him, and by myself above, meant simply to assert that in all he did say, he did use language identical in meaning with that I attributed to him in general terms, and very clearly and unequivocally signified his determination not to read the letters referred to, while a certain person was present. Where I did use his own words, I gave him the credit of them by quotation marks, but of these he does not see fit to take any notice, though the use of them is prima facie evidence that he was in precisely the position in which I have represented him to be.

One would suppose from Mr. Cleveland's letter, that he had simply remarked he would read certain letters to his friends, if there were no objection, and that when a person present prevented this by proposing to retire because she was not a friend, that he begged her not to do so for her presence could not make the slightest difference. If he means to convey this impression,—and I can make nothing else of his letter—I can only admire the effrontery of the assertion, or marvel at the blindness which could persuade itself, that to those cognizant of the facts, such a representation of the occurrence could be believed as the true one. Let me repeat the facts more connectedly, and at large than I have done, having before me the testimony to their truth, which may be relied on, if Mr. Cleveland, or any one else, is disposed to doubt the accuracy of my memory, on which the former relation was entirely, and it will be seen, correctly, based.

After the meeting was called to order, Mr. Cleveland rose, and proposed, in nearly the words he has given, to read certain letters. There was no apparent intention on his part of proceeding with the reading, but as if he meant that his presumption that all present *were* friends of the Liberty party, should be understood as a presumption that all present *were not* friends, he *sat down*. Mrs. Burleigh rose and declared her purpose in being present, and proposed to retire. She was followed by Morgan J. Thomas, and George H. Earle, who expressed the wish that she should not leave the room. One after another, to the number of nearly half the meeting, declared publicly their concurrence in this wish. To all this, so important to a true understanding of the case, there is no reference in Mr. Cleveland's letter, but the reader is left to suppose that he was interrupted in the reading of the letters by Mrs. Burleigh, and that he "*at once*," on learning her name, said "he hoped she would keep her seat." After much, however, had been said in favor of Mrs. Burleigh's remaining, and said too in such a manner, as warranted a strong inference, at least, that the objection, on the part of the President, to her remaining, was understood by his friends to be, because she was a woman, a wish was expressed that the letters be now read. Then, and not till then, did the President rise, and instead of reading the letters, notwithstanding the strong expression of feeling and opinion that had been given by members of the Convention, replied, that *he should not read them* "*under present circumstances*,"—or words to that effect. Mrs. Burleigh again arose, conceiving, as she said in her narration, that she was "the *present circumstance*," and declared her intention of retiring, saying as she did so, that she should charge her expulsion, not to Liberty party, but to the President of the meeting. As she approached the door, she was called to, by one of the gentlemen, to listen to the President, who was about to speak. It was then he assured her, that he was not aware, when he first spoke, who she was, or that any person present was unfriendly to the cause; and added, "but you certainly cannot object to my reading my private letters to those only whom I please."

Now why he sat down after announcing his intention of reading the letters,—or why this new knowleege, that the "present circumstance" was Mrs. Gertrude K. Burleigh, should in any way change the aspect of affairs,—or wherein consisted the necessity of his last words, just quoted—why he should, during the discussion have declared it to be "indelicate," (I am certain of the term, for it was read from the note-book of a Liberty party man, who took it down on the spot,) for her to be present, though in the same breath he expressed his wish that "their proceedings should be *public*"—or why he should have permitted a discussion to continue, which he could have at any moment terminated,—or how it was that he was so entirely misunderstood by his own most intimate friends, and their evidence given in corroboration of the testimony of Mrs. Burleigh, which I have just repeated,—are questions which perhaps Professor Cleveland can answer satisfactorily, but which I confess my utter inability, in view of all the circumstances, to reconcile with all the assertions and apparent meaning of that gentleman's letter. But I have narrated the facts simply as I understand them to have occurred, and without any comment of my own, I think, every reader of the Standard would very readily understand that they most fully and unequivocally corroborate the relation given in the article on the Norristown meeting—a relation made, by the bye, not from any feeling of hostility, as has been insinuated, towards Professor Cleveland, for I never saw or heard of the gentleman before that visit to Philadelphia, and of course knew nothing of him, but simply as an occurrence which took place in the meeting, and had an important bearing upon its action. If, however, his conduct in this affair should appear to have been "improper," "indelicate," or "insulting," he will, I trust, impute it, not to any representation of mine, but to the unfortunate circumstance that he did in effect do the very thing which he declares he did not, and which he will remember, being done, is thus characterized by these offensive terms, not by me, but by himself.—G.

THE DISUNION RESOLUTIONS.

On the second page of to-day's paper will be found an article on Disunion, by Mr. Bowditch. It is written in a calm and candid spirit, and is evidently the result of sincere and conscientious conviction. Most of the real argument contained in it has been before presented, but it is not wanting in the merit of great ingenuity, and the attractiveness of farther illustration, and in some points, of a new form. It is chiefly, however, addressed to Mr. Phillips, and it is his place to reply to it. I wish only to say a few words on the question really at issue,—whether we ought to continue our support of a pro-slavery Government; for coming to a decision as to what our duty is on that point, the other questions,—whether we can pay taxes,—import goods,—hold property,—or remain in the country,—are subsequent questions, to be decided when it shall be known that these cannot be done, consistently with the first duty which we shall have decided as obligatory

It may be because of my own obtuseness, but I cannot see why, if it shall be granted at the outset, that there exists the right or power to create some form of human government, and granting also that Governments are created for the purpose of ensuring the rights, and protecting the best interests of the governed, that when it shall be found, that the end to be obtained is not reached, why the right or power granted in the first instance, does not still remain, and men have still the same right or power to attempt again what they have failed once in obtaining. It is granted that the present Constitution of the United States was created to secure certain great and good ends by those who framed it, but we in our day, finding that one good, and that of the utmost importance,—that of personal liberty, without which all other rights are a mere mockery—has not been secured to the people, have certainly the original right which those framers exercised of creating anew, a Government which shall indeed do that which they failed in doing. And here is the important point—have we found the present Government to fail of its purpose,—and have we the right to demand one that shall secure the end proposed? I cannot see it as a very abstruse or difficult question.

We know that one-sixth of the people are not protected in any of the rights which belong to humanity—that for them the existing Constitution has utterly failed, or rather never pretended, to answer the purpose of a true Government. We know that they are men—"of one blood" with ourselves. For them, then, we have the right to demand the overthrow of that Constitution as a worthless thing. This would seem plain enough, and hardly a mooted question, for every Government that was ever created since the first one, has been created on precisely this principle of substituting a new and better one, for the old and poor one that no longer answered its purpose. True, it has been usually done by violent and bloody revolution, but that alone could not make the change a right one, or woe! for the world if it be so. The only peaceful way for us, at least in the present instance, to create the new to take the place of the old, is to stand apart from the old, and demand the new, and by the use of course of all moral power, to so act upon the people, that they will bring about the *re-form* which is needed.

But it will be at once answered, that there is another peaceful way, and that is to act with the Government now existing, and with the powers that be create the new power. And here comes at once the question in dispute. Can I give a voluntary support to this power, by exercising any of its functions? In very many cases, undoubtedly we may. For example, the Constitution of the United States gives to the Executive the veto power, and does not forbid the same man to be chosen twice President. I may think that an alteration is necessary in both these particulars, and through the power of a party may endeavor to effect the desired changes. And this I may do without guilt, for I commit no immoral act in taking an oath to support a Constitution which is not as I would have it in certain points merely political. But another question arises. I have discovered that one of the features of the Constitution is, that over the whole land, where it is the supreme law, a man may be deprived of all his rights, if in a certain portion of that land, a local law over which as a citizen I can have no control, has already deprived him of them. I, of course,—and this is granted,—am *particeps criminis* in this outrage. This is not merely a political question, but one which involves a moral duty. What shall I do? Shall I voluntarily participate in a Government which requires of me at the outset, an oath to do that which I consider a sin against God and man? Or shall I swear to do that which I do not mean to do, and so perjure myself, because at the same time I assent to certain good things which are done by the same power. If I may not for conscience' sake do this, because it leads me into certain inconsistencies,—granting for the sake of argument that it does,—I am indeed in a dilemma, for no peaceful remedy is left me, and I have no alternative,—believing that such a Government should not exist by my will,—but the old one of sword and gun. Or to state the argument more succinctly—I cannot act with the Government for its change, in the given case, for it is against my conscience to swear to do an immoral act: I cannot refrain from acting with the Government, for it is proven that if I fly to the uttermost parts of the earth I cannot escape some similar responsibility: It is wrong, however, to support such a Government, and I must then overthrow it by violence. This, however, I might also esteem wrong, and no ground is left me to stand upon. Here is another of the *reductiones ad absurdum* which seem as plentiful as arguments. Our friends who are endeavoring to show our position as untenable, commit the solecism in logic, of proving too much. They would prove that the right to create anew a Government, and the duty of obeying one's own conscience, are incompatible, while they grant each may and should be done. The real difficulty after all, I apprehend, has been entirely overlooked. It should be proven that man has no right to have a conscience, and the whole difficulty would be at once done away with.

The mistake, however, seems to be that, which Mr. Phillips has already pointed out, that the proper distinction is lost sight of between voluntarily and involuntarily support in the first place, and in the second, between immoality and inexpediency. We may rightfully support a Government which does certain acts which we may deem inexpedient, with the intention of correcting a merely political evil or abuse, but we may not support one which is immoral. It is said that we never can have a perfect Government. Very true. But in the first formation of every Commonwealth, its morality is in perfect accordance with the highest standard of right at that time existing in the hearts of the people. Probably all of the Abolitionists, excepting the small body of Non-Resistants, could now, and would gladly, support our Government as perfectly in accordance with the principles of justice and morality, if the objectionable feature of Slavery was stricken out of it, and abolished throughout the country; and if in addition to this, the life-taking principle was also abjured, the Non-Resistants themselves would readily give it their support. It is now supported by the great body of the people themselves because Slavery is not really held as immoral; and it was created by our fathers, as entirely in accordance with the morality of their times, because Slavery was looked upon as a political evil, if considered one at all, rather than a moral wrong. This principle has always held good. Theft was legal among the Lacedemonians, because it was honorable and moral; when it ceased to be the latter, it ceased to be legal also. We have never reached perfection, and never shall. But we should never even progress towards it, if we may not from time to time, indeed if we *must* not assert the higher truth we may have reached, and demand that the Institutions by which we are surrounded, shall be in accordance with the higher principles of action which we believe we have discovered, and by which we ought to square our lives. It is the mission of this age to bring about great revolutions by peaceful means, and by the passive power of ceasing to do wrong, accomplish that which the past has done by active violence. Our work is not objective only, but chiefly subjective, and because the circumstances by which we are surrounded, do still involve us in the consequence of others' guilt, we are not therefore to cease from voluntary and active participation in wrong-doing.—G.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

An Address delivered in the Court House in Concord, Massachusetts, on the First of August, 1844—on the Anniversary of the Emancipation of the Negroes in the British West Indies. By R. W. Emerson. Published by request. Boston. James Monroe & Company.

It is with no small pleasure that I feel authorized to speak of Ralph Waldo Emerson, in any other than an incidental manner, in an Anti-Slavery paper. I might not, perhaps, venture to speak of him at all anywhere else, except in some private way, and to friends, but having watched his life now for some years, from the moment when he shook himself free from the trammels of Unitarianism, in Boston, and having been a reader of his books, sometimes a listener at his lectures, and sympathizing always deeply, so far as I knew how, with his thought, it is no slight gratification to me to see him standing in a higher and nobler position than he has before ventured to take. The day has passed by, in New England, when to be openly and avowedly pro-slavery is even reputable, and every untrue man on this subject must be a hypocrite, also, and pretend to anti-slavery if he has it not. It is indeed now held to be quite becoming, and almost necessary to fashionable piety to have the name of anti-slavery; and to a certain class of pseudo *dilletanti*, who are also pseudo pietists, it has become an absolute necessity in their patent scheme of religion-made-easy to take upon themselves the names of Abolitionists on select occasions, such as the Massachusetts Fair for a morning lounge, or an enthusiastic meeting at Faneuil Hall, or the State House. Other some also who languish in an ætherialized atmosphere of æsthetic religion, rarified almost to a vacuum for common souls, do rather patronize the Abolitionists, as mortals of whom there is still hope, being yet in the dispensation of which they themselves have had spiritual experience,—or at least are pleased to look upon us as the disembodied spirit may be supposed to watch and pity the blind and finite efforts of those still in the flesh.

Of this last class Mr. Emerson has been claimed as the apostle. Taking his stand-point really above the multitude, and looking on the Anti-Slavery reform, as well as all others, with the eye of a Christian philosopher, he has, in his thought, and in all the true influence he has exerted, embraced the essential principles of Anti-Slavery, though he has not been an active worker in this special reform. When called upon to work at all, or to speak at all, he has done both with and for the Abolitionists, and not against them, as has been the case with some who have claimed to be governed by the Anti-Slavery sentiment, and has never, unlike these also, been obliged to define his position as anti-slavery and anti-abolition at the same time. Many of his followers and admirers have thought they were at one with him on this point, when in fact they were at the very antipodes of each other, for they cannot, as he has, naturally and easily step from the position he has heretofore occupied to that of an active worker, even on a special occasion. I have understood that Mr. Emerson felt himself flattered by an invitation from the Abolitionists to deliver this address. And well he might, for it is no slight compliment to the honesty and truthfulness of the man, that he could be held as an exception to the general rule, "that those who are not of them are against them," and that men whose self-sacrificing and uncompromising spirit he both knew and reverenced, could so far know him as to believe him worthy to advocate a cause, hated and despised by the people, but really embracing in itself all of the elements of true progress, and the hope of the age. His own greatness is enhanced by the fact, and when viewed aright, increased by the manner in which his work has been performed.

The Address is straight-forward, earnest, and truthful. Belittled by no apology for doing this thing, or by any cattering to popular prejudice, by making the hackneyed distinction between himself and those who are known as the advocates of this cause. It is stained by no affected squeamishness of harsh language, no tirade against fierce fanaticism, no cant of fault-finding, and no twaddle of an overweening sympathy for slaveholders. It is direct and to the point, and looks to the whole subject in the strongest light, and from the best point of view, and comes without hesitation to the highest and best conclusions. It is a production worthy the subject and the writer, which is the highest praise that can be given it.—G.

CHARLES T. TORREY.

By late accounts from Baltimore we learn that Mr. Torrey has made an unsuccessful attempt to escape from the Baltimore jail. He had been supplied with saws and files from some person without the walls, to cut out the iron bars of his window, and with pistol, powder, and ball, to effect his escape by their use, if it could not be done otherwise. The attempt—in which several were engaged—was unsuccessful, owing to their own carelessness, in entrusting to a boy the bit of looking-glass which was held outside the window to warn them by its reflection of the approach of any person from without. The boy amused himself by casting the reflection in various directions, till it attracted the attention of one of the keepers, who, suspecting what was going on, came stealthily beneath the window, and listened till he discovered that Torrey and his associates were filing off the bars. A stop was of course immediately put to their attempts, and all reconfined in new cells. All the comforts which had been given him have been taken away, and he is now confined by heavy irons. His accomplices without the prison are not known, but I understand from my informant, that when he left Baltimore, a warrant had been issued for the arrest of Mr. Andrews—one of Mr. Torrey's counsel, of Boston. This attempt it seems to me to be a very foolish one. It is probable he would have been acquitted on his trial, or at least so far as public sentiment could effect that end, it was strongly with Torrey, and to some extent even in Baltimore. By this ill-advised action he will, in some degree, cut himself off from that sympathy, among those who are not Abolitionists, and especially from the people in a slaveholding State, who will presume the attempt to be prima facie evidence of guilt. It would have been wiser at any rate to have awaited the decision of the Courts, and if condemned to punishment, everybody would then have applauded and rejoiced at his escape.

ANTI-SLAVERY MEETING IN A SLAVE STATE.

The first Anti-Slavery meeting in Delaware, was held a fortnight ago, in Wilmington. Placards were posted in the most conspicuous places, and the meeting convened in the most populous part of the town. As in Virginia, the attention seemed rather to be turned to the political than the moral aspects of the subject, as the laws of the State, the effect of Slavery upon her prosperity, and the wrong of voting for slaveholders, seemed to be the prominent points of discussion. The "wickedness of slaveholding," is also mentioned by the Liberty Herald as a topic of discussion, but the other points seem to have received the most attention. It is very natural they should, and it may be that the subject may be approached, and its advocates left unmolested, in the borders of the slave States, while this low view is presented, when discussion on Anti-Slavery pure and proper would not be for a moment permitted. But these are cheering signs of the times, and very gladly do I chronicle them.

At the close of this meeting the following resolutions were passed, with only one or two dissenting voices:

Resolved, That Slavery ought to be abolished in Delaware at the next session of its legislature.

Resolved, That we will vote for no candidate for office, unless he is in favor of such abolition.

THE LIBERTY HERALD.

I have received the first number of this paper, published at Philadelphia. It is an advocate of Liberty party, but whether it shall be published longer than during the Presidential canvass, will depend upon the support given it. Thomas S. Cavender is the Editor.

EXTRA.

A Standard Extra will be issued to-day, containing Mr. Quincy's article on James G. Birney. It will be for sale at this office by the hundred, dozen, or single.

GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

Foreign.

ENGLAND.

By several late arrivals, here and at Boston, we have dates from England to August 23. The following items are all that there is of interest.

The particulars of the bombardment of *Tangier* by the Prince de Joinville, are given at length; and, according to the Spanish papers, the young Prince, flushed with his success, was about to inflict like vengeance on Magadore, Saleo, and Larache.

The French forces, however, nowhere attempt to occupy the territory, and so long as they abstain from that, all cause of offence to the British Government, or other Governments, is avoided. This is the distinction taken by the London Times, and other journals.

Ten thousand hill Coolies (natives of the hill country, India,) were, says the *Greenock Advertiser* about to be shipped from Calcutta and Bombay, for Demerara, Trinidad and Jamaica, with the consent of the Government, and under bonds from these colonies for their good treatment. The cost of transporting them is estimated at £12 sterling ($60 per head.)

The Queen and her baby continued to do well.

TEXAS.

We learn by the Picayune of the 8th, that by a late arrival at New Orleans, despatches were brought for the United States Government, and for the British and French ministers at Washington. They are supposed to refer to the invasion of Texas. It is rumored that General Woll has arrived on the banks of the Rio Grande, with 10,000 of the advance of the Mexican army.

Commodore J. T. K. Lothrop, of the Texan army, and a native of Massachusetts died on the 14th ultimo.

The Shelby County (Texas) Disturbances.—The latest intelligence we have from the "seat of war" is received through the *Caddo Gazette* of the 21st ultimo, and leads to the apprehension of the most serious consequences. The parties are said to have respectively fortified themselves, and vowed against each other total extermination or expulsion from the country. As was before stated, one of the leaders of the "Regulators" Davidson, has been killed. On the occasion on which he received his death wound, the two parties singled out man to man; Davidson shot his adversary, (who it is thought will not survive,) through the lower jaw bone, who, after he had received the wound, killed Davidson. Boulware, who in connection with Davidson, has for some time been at the head of a party, and who is a very determined man, has declared that one party or the other shall conquer before it is done with, and that the conquered must leave the country. An informant of the *Gazette* states that at the time he left Harrison county, fifty men were in readiness to proceed immediately to the assistance of the "Regulators" who had proved victorious until the 16th ultimo when in a pitched battle they were beaten. It is stated that so far 80 men have been killed in all. Application has been made by the neutrals to President Houston (so it is said) to quell the insurrection, but he replies to them that "they must fight their own battles, and settle their own difficulties." This is indeed a most lamentable state of things, and it is impossible to state where it will end.—*N. O. Pic.*

General Items.

The Princeton's Big Gun.—The September number of the Franklin Institute contains the conclusions of the committee appointed to investigate the causes of the explosion on board the Princeton. The substance of their opinion is, that the metal of the gun, though not bad in itself, was in an unfit state for the purpose for which it was applied, and required more working; that it was not properly welded; and finally, that from the difficulty of rendering such vast masses of wrought iron of a perfect soundness and uniformity throughout, and the uncertainty that must always prevail as to the welding, &c. the use of wrought iron guns of large calibre, in the present state of the arts, is not advisable. At the same time the committee do not wish to be understood as expressing any opinion whether the construction of a safe wrought iron gun upon some other plan, is practicable, or impracticable, in the present state of the arts, inasmuch as this subject has not been referred to them by the Department.

Worse and Worse.—A butcher of Albany was stopped by the Helderberg Indians, while in the country buying cattle, and commanded to Halloo—"Down with the rent." He told them he did not care anything about the rent or them, and he would not halloo. The command was repeated, and he again refused; and thereupon he was stripped, and showered with a pailful of tar. Is not this monstrous!

Row among the "Saints."—The Warsaw Signal says, that one day, week before last, Bishop George Miller, who is Trustee in trust for the Church of Latter Day Saints, got into a quarrel with Elder Lyman Wight, which, from words arose to blows. The result was, that the Bishop got a severe drubbing. A man by the name of Woodworth, architect of the Temple, fell aboard of Wight, after the latter had done with Miller, and gave him, in turn, a satisfactory dressing.

Hon. JOHN Q. ADAMS has been unanimously renominated for Congress by the Whigs of the eighth (Norfolk) Congressional District, Massachusetts.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT.

JOHN A. BRYAN, of Ohio, to be Charge d'Affaires to the Republic of Peru.

THOMAS D. MOSELEY, to be Attorney of the United States for the middle District of Tennessee, in the place of John M. Lea, resigned.

Consuls.

ROBERT WALSH, of Pennsylvania, for the city of Paris.

ALEXANDER TOD, for Alexandria, in Egypt, in the place of John Giddon, deceased.

ROBERT L. MCINTOSH, for the port of Lufowehou, in China.

JOHN B. WILLIAMS, of Massachusetts, for the Auckland Islands, in the Pacific Ocean, in lieu of his appointment for the "Bay of Islands," in New Zealand, revoked.

GABRIEL G. FLEUROT, of New-York, consul for the Island of Martinique.

ISADORE GUILLET, Commercial Agent at the Island of St. Thomas.

CHARLES M. PREVOST, Marshal of the Territory of Wiskonsan.

ENEAS MCFAUL, jr. of Baltimore, Consul for Laguna de Termines, in the Mexican Republic, in the place of L. Almy, resigned.

Dr. FRANKLIN LIPPINCOTT, of New Jersey, Consul for Cien Fuegos, in the Island of Cuba, in the place of Samuel McLean, transferred to the Consulate at Trinadad de Cuba.

ROBERT C. EWING, Marshal for the District of Missouri, in the place of William C. Anderson resigned.

JOHN L. SMITH, Justice of the Peace in the County of Washington, in the District of Columbia.

Anti-Slavery Items.

Singular Decision.—In the District Court of New Orleans, the following clause in the will of the late Stephen Henderson was decided by Judge Buchanan to be void, because a compliance with the condition contained therein (printed in italics) is impossible in law:

"All the children that are born five years after my death, if females, are to be free at the age of twenty years and male children at the age of twenty-five; and at the end of the five years, as aforesaid, there may be drawn by lot, out of all the slaves, ten—five males and five females—who will be furnished with a free passage to our settlement in Africa, and one hundred dollars each, but they must go of their own free will, *and to return to slavery if ever they return back to this country.* At the end of ten years, twenty may be emancipated in the same manner as the first five, and in twenty-five years all the first born free may be sent off with the entire remainder of the old stock that are willing to go, so as that at the end of twenty-five years from my death there will not be upon any of my estates any other slaves but the apprentice children, and if the other slaves do not wish to go to Africa, they will remain upon their respective plantations upon which they reside as apprentices, and to be provided for accordingly; but to be strictly under the management of the overseer, as well as all their offspring, the whole to be considered as apprentices, and their labor to be applied to the general good of my succession."

We had supposed that where the taking effect of a devise is by the terms of the will made dependent on the performance of an absurd and impracticable condition the condition is held to be a nullity, and the devise to be operative notwithstanding. Another fundamental rule of construction, viz: that which requires the court to give effect to the intention of the testator, seems to us to have been utterly disregarded in this decision, relative to a clause wherein the benevolent and humane intentions of the testator are manifested as clearly as language can express them.—*Journal of Commerce.*

Horrible Outrage.—We learn from a gentleman, who came down the river yesterday, that an affray took place at Childers's Hotel, in Vicksburgh on Friday afternoon last, between a man by the name of Porter, who is said to be an overseer, a man of desperate character, and a highly respectable young man, a carpenter, named Waters, which resulted in the death of the latter. The facts of the case, as we are informed, are these. Waters made a statement with regard to some trifling matter, which Porter in a very insulting manner, denied and offered to bet it was not so. Waters replied he did not wish to bet, and as his conversation was directed to others, he declined having anything to do with him. Porter then threatened to whip him, which he told him to do at his peril. Porter then endeavored to borrow a pistol, saying that he would have revenge, but not succeeding, he left the bar-room, obtained and concealed a knife, and then returned and attacked Waters with a whip, and on his resistance, stabbed him to the heart, and when the bystanders took hold of his arm, he with a savage ferocity, twisted the knife in the wound that he might make sure work. He was forthwith arrested, and it remains to be seen how the authorities of Vicksburg will deal with such a blood-thirsty, ferocious, and cold-blooded murderer.—*N. O. Tropic.*

Florida.—Two negroes stole a boat, and ran away from the St. Lucia settlement, on the 2d instant. As soon as it was discovered that they had gone, a party of the settlers started in pursuit up the inland passage. On reaching New Smyrna, they discovered the brig Casco in sight, when they proceeded to her for the purpose of making inquiry relative to the negroes. To their surprise, they found the negroes on board, whither they had reached in a squall. The negroes were endeavoring to return to Brunswick, Georgia. They are now in confinement in this city.—*News.*

Slavery.—The following instances of the barbarous treatment of slaves occurred lately at Cayenne. Mr. Clatilde, the proprietor of an estate in the island, and his wife, were arraigned before the Court Royale of the colony, for whipping to death one of their young slaves, a girl only ten years old. The mother took the dead body of her child on her back, and, laying it down at the feet of the magistrate, piteously cried for justice on its murderers. Clatilde and his wife were brought to trial, but the woman was acquitted, and the only punishment inflicted on the cruel master was one year's imprisonment, and forfeiture of all property in the dead child's mother.—*Galignani.*

Delights of Slavery.—The correspondent of the New-York Republic at, Havana, writes as follows:—The arrests are numerous, and proceed with more celerity than ever. Alas! alas! we shall soon be without a single negro to serve us. With respect to serving us, I have forgotten to tell you that in many good houses in this country, people live solely on eggs, which they eat from the shell, for their fear of poison is so great, that they would not for aught in the world, be persuaded to eat of the smallest *ragouts* made by their black cooks."

NOTICES.

WINDHAM COUNTY.—(POSTPONED.)

The Windham County Anti-Slavery Society will hold a meeting in Chaplin, on Thursday, the 20th (not 13th) instant, commencing at 10 o'clock, a. m.

It is to be hoped the abolitionists in this vicinity will rally in mass to this meeting. Speakers of ability and eminence are expected to be present.

JAMES B. WHITCOMB. Sec'y.

THE ELEVENTH MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR.

This annual effort for the sustentation of the anti-slavery cause, will be made in Amory Hall, Boston, commencing on Tuesday, December 24th, 1844. By its means it is, that the debts of the cause, last year, were discharged; so that it is, at this moment, free to put its unencumbered strength, in the prosecution of THE HUNDRED CONVENTIONS, through the medium of which, this appeal reaches you. If you wish slavery to cease, you cannot more effectually aid in its extinction, than by upholding this Fair. The experience of ten years enables the women of Massachusetts to present it to you as an effectual channel, through which your sympathy may unite with that of others, to swell the flood of effort by which high principle shall be diffused, and right feeling excited, till the horrible institution of slavery shall be swept away.

None of the funds raised by means of this Fair are ever permitted to run to waste in building up a political party, or in defraying electioneering expenses. They are used to promulgate, through the press, and by the living voice, the truths of freedom, which convert men's hearts to the cause. We give a guaranty for the economical and judicious disposal of them, by providing for their expenditure by the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society. Without going back for years, to recapitulate former help, the beneficial consequences of which are in perpetual glow, we will simply state that the proceeds of this last year's Fair were TWENTY-ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS, exclusive of many small appropriations, and the necessary expenses; and that, lacking the prospect of this aid, neither the Hundred Western Conventions, nor the Hundred Conventions now in progress through Massachusetts would have been undertaken. The influence of the cause might be increased ten-fold, by means of that aid from the commonwealth generally, which it is disposed, if the way were open, to afford. A few words of suggestion may open this way. Permit us to make them for the cause's sake.

First. We entreat whomsoever this sheet reaches, instantly to announce an intention of aiding the ELEVENTH MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR, and to form, if possible, a little circle for weekly anti-slavery effort through the year. Gain all the aid possible, but *wait for no one else.* Whoever begins will be the nucleus round which much help will gather at length.

Second. To remember that there is nothing useful or ornamental—no mechanical, agricultural, or manufacturing product—nothing either to eat, drink, or wear—no work of taste or art, for household use or decoration—but will (so perfect have our arrangements at length become) be made as available to the cause as its worth in money.

Third. To correspond with us for the purpose of benefiting us by your suggestions, and receiving the aid of ours. For it may often be in the power of all the friends of the cause, mutually to aid each other by the interchange of materials and labor, and by furnishing the newest patterns of articles of dress, or models of articles of furniture.

There surely needs no searching argument or eloquent appeal to commend the cause of freedom and humanity to professed republicans and Christians. All see and feel that it is a good and noble thing to spring to the relief and rescue of one human being undergoing wrong, or peril, or suffering. But here are will-nigh THREE MILLIONS, undergoing all the suffering, wrong, and peril of SLAVERY, that incarnation of all that is dreadful to the sons and daughters of Massachusetts, while all that universal man holds dear and holy is endangered by the existence of such a blighting institution. Righteous principle dies out—good feeling is extinguished—our country is endangered—our character as a people dishonored; and will not you, who admire a single act of devotedness, though done but for a single human being, be true to your own moral nature, and gladly give time, labor, money, prayer, sacrifice, that so you may save a nation—redeem a race—ennoble an age?

Let us hear from you speedily, and consider us your servants for the cause's sake,

M. W. Chapman,	*Ann T. G. Phillips,*
Mary G. Chapman,	*Susan C. Cabot,*
Eliza L. Follen,	*Olivia Bowditch,*
Sarah S. Russell,	*Sarah B. Shaw,*
Hellen E. Garrison,	*Lavinia Hilton,*
Anne Warren Weston,	*Thankful Southwick,*
Henrietta Sargent,	*Maria White,*
Frances Mary Robbins,	*Louisa Loring,*
Hannah Tufts,	*Catherine Sargent,*
M. A. W Johnson,	*Caroline Weston,*
Anna R. Philbrick,	*Mary Young,*
Harriet B. Jackson,	*Mary F. Rogers,*
Louisa M. Sewall,	*Caroline F. Williams,*
Abby Southwick,	*Mary Willey, Bramhall.*
Marian Fuller,	*Ann R. Bramhall.*

BOSTON, February 8, 1844.

FRIENDS OF THE SLAVE.

It is proposed to hold a series of conventions throughout the State of Ohio, this summer and fall, to spread Anti-Slavery light and truth abroad, and awaken the people to a sense of their responsibilities in reference to this all-important subject. We appeal to you, fellow-citizens, to your sympathies and sense of justice, for the means of keeping such men as Amos Dresser and Henry Bibb in the field; the one to show what we have to do with slavery, the other to tell of the wrongs and sufferings of the slave, (he having been one of the sufferers,) with pathos and natural eloquence that goes directly to the heart, awakening the tender sympathies of the soul and taking directly hold of the individual's conscience.

Shall they and all others be enabled to plead the cause of freedom and rebuke the wrong?

Shall tongues be mute when deeds are wrought,
That well might shame extremest hell,
Shall freemen lack the indignant thought,
Shall mercy's bosom cease to swell?
"Shall honor bleed, shall truth succumb,
Shall pen, and thought, and soul be dumb.
By all above, around, below,
Be our indignant answer, No.
"Up then in freedom's manly part,
From grey-head eld to fiery youth,
And on the nation's naked heart,
Scatter the living coals of truth."

Contributions and pledges can be handed to A. F. Hanna, Cadiz, and Cyrus McNeely, Harrison county, Jane Boyd, Lloydsville, Belmont county, Thomas Moore, Carroll county, George Garretson, Treasurer, New Lisbon,

Poetry.

TO THE IDEAL.

BY BULWER.

But not to them, the Lyre—God's sons, is given
Alone the light of the Ideal Heaven:
Alike thy power o'er souls more arm'd and stern,
And Earth's great truths drink freshness from thy urn!
In the dim cell where lofty Sydney told
The hours before the morn on which his soul
Trod, with unfaltering steps and firm, the old
But unworn bridge to our eternal goal,
Arching the drear Invisible,—the vast
Abyss that holds the secret of the past:—
In that lone cell what thoughts, what white-rob'd dreams,
Kept watch, like vestals o'er the holy fire,
Round the bright altar of his high desire!
Thou, his Unfound Ideal! thou, whose beams
Broke through earth's bars upon his upward eye,
Thou, his beloved—his cherished—his adored—
His creature, yet creator—LIBERTY!
Thou that didst twine around the Athenian's sword
The wreaths made sacred when Hipparchus fell,
Wert THOU not with him in that glorious cell,
Didst thou not fill the darkness with bright things
And mighty prophecies of times to be?
Thy love hath wrought these fetters but the wings
No chains could curb, were eagle-plumed by thee!
Thou gavest the dungeon,—but the key to Heaven:
Thou gav'st the death-blow, but the deathless fame:
The thunder rolled around, but though the riven
And stormy clouds, the Future's Angel came,
And in the chamber where the doomed man sate,
Foretold the brightening march of human fate!
On the grim scaffold, with the axe on high,
To thee the patriot lifts his dauntless eye,
Reeks not the crowd below, the headsman near,
The gaze—the pause—the pity and the fear.
Bright through the waste the burning column beams,
Lights the blessed land—the Canaan of his dreams,
By Freedom's blood Futurity is freed,
And from each drop springs forth the Dragon Seed!

Is not thy name Consoler? Do we ask
A gift, thou calm'st us with its gilded seeming!
Life is a wayward child: thy mother-task
Is still to rock the cradle of its dreaming!—
Exalter as consoler! Dost thou not
Raise altars in our hearts to THE SUBLIME?
What were our thoughts without thy worship? What
Were this dark islet in the seas of Time
Hedged round by petty wants and low desire,
But for thy love—the commune of the skies,—
Great Magian of stars? Thy creed inspires
All that we ween of noble! Poesy,—
Religion, and the soul's archangel, Fame,—
Unconquered Liberty,—the wish to be
Better and brighter than we are—our claim
To make men great and bless'd, and consummate
Our likeness to the glorious shapes of heaven—
The yearnings to outleap our mortal state,
And climb Olympus—are they not all given
By thee—all thine?—but longings to obey
Thy haunting oracles that our clay
To make the Unseen with actual glories rife
And call the starred IDEAL into life?
* * * * * *
Seraph that art within me! Comforter!
Apostle, preaching holy thoughts and heaven!
Scorner of all things base,—albeit, to err
Is our life's lot, yet it may be forgiven
If we err nobly, and one mean desire
Methinks would scare the Angel from its ward.
Thus do I feed thine altars with a fire
Which Thought must wear a priestly robe to guard,
And with a solemn conscience and serene,
Watch the flame chase the mists from every scene;
Making a worship of the beautiful,
Whether on earth or in the human heart
And seeking from this shadowy vale, to cull
The flowers wherein I learn the gentle art,
To waft an incense of sweet thoughts above;
Thus have I imaged virtue, as a seen
And felt divinity, and filled with love,
As I believe God wills us—all the springs
In which life stirs the universe of things.

Lo! as I write, before my lattice waves
The wild wood, where the midnight winds rejoice,
And the lone stars are on the stream, that laves
The green banks, wailing with a spirit's voice;
And these thy presence consecrates to me:
'Tis not the common turf, or wave, or sky;—
In every herb thy holiness I see,
And in each breeze thy low voice murmurs by.
My heart is wed to sadness, and my frame
Bows from the vigor of my earlier youth,
And much it roused my rapture once to name,
Won now too late, hath lost the power to soothe:
But Thou, unscathed by time's destroying blast,
Coverest the wintry earth with verdure to the last!—
Still be thou mine, and in the paths of strife,
The public toil, against the public wrong
Through which I labor out the ends of life,
Raise thou my spirit with thy sacred song;
Point ever upward to the noblest aim,
To raise the lowly, nor to fear the strong;—
Bid me yet hope to leave a freeman's name
With my land's loftier hopes not loosely twined,
So that my grave this epitaph may claim,
"Peace to his errors—HE HATH SERVED MANKIND."

FREEDOM.

BY ALFRED TENNYSON.

Of old sat Freedom on the heights,
The thunders breaking at her feet;
Above her shook the starry lights:
She heard the torrents meet.

Within her place she did rejoice,
Self-gathered in her prophet-mind,
But fragments of her mighty voice
Came rolling on the wind.

Then stept she down thro' town and field,
To mingle with the human race,
And part by part to men revealed
The fullness of her face—

Grave mother of majestic works,
From her isle-altar gazing down,
Who, God-like, grasps the triple forks,
And, King-like, wears the crown:

Her open eyes desire the truth.
The wisdom of a thousand years
Is in them. May perpetual youth
Keep dry their light from tears;

That her fair form may stand and shine,
Make bright our days and light our dreams,
Turning to scorn with lips divine,
The falsehood of extremes!

SONNET.—THE REFORMER.

BY R. H. BACON.

The true Reformer, like the pioneer,
Who hews the western forest, must throw by
All thought of ease or resting till he die:
Nor in his noble breast admit the fear
Of ill; although, through life, he may not hear
The voice of friend, nor see one loving eye
To cheer him on his way of duty high,
And warn him when his foes are lurking near!
Yet fields of beauty, by his dauntless hand,
Shall rise in loveliness, where now the gloom
Of error doth the light of Truth withstand;
The lonely wilderness he fells shall bloom
Throughout all aftertime; and those who now
Scowl with mad hate, before his tomb shall bow!

Miscellany.

EXTRACTS FROM ABBY'S JOURNAL.

[Not yet republished in the United States.]

SLAVERY IN LOUISIANA

SEVERITY OF PUNISHMENT—MEASURES—EXTENT OF CRIME.

What, then, must be the amount of suffering which prompted the offence, and that of cruelty which suggested the repression brought to view in the following act?

"If any person or persons, &c. shall cut or break any iron chain or collar, which any master of slaves should have used in order to prevent the running away or escape of any such slave or slaves, such person, &c. so offending, shall, on conviction, &c. be fined not less than two hundred dollars, nor exceeding one thousand dollars, and suffer imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years, nor less than six months."—*Act of Louisiana Assembly*, 1819.

CAPACITY AND CHARACTER OF SLAVES.

It has been asserted by those who have an interest in concealing the truth, or are too indolent to seek it, that the slave has neither the inclination nor the ability to provide for himself, and that to give him freedom would be to misapply kindness by injuring its object. I had abundant opportunity of submitting these assertions to the only test, by which their accuracy can be ascertained; and I can honestly declare that an impartial induction from indisputable facts, has led me to an opposite conclusion. I conversed freely and frequently with many of those who had passed immediately from bondage to freedom, and were pursuing the same course of industry which had purchased them the blessing of the transition. I found them as intelligent, civil, and attentive to the duties required of them in their several employments and relations in life, as any of those who are neither disfranchised of their natural rights, nor exposed to the scorn and bad passions of their neighbors. While visiting at their houses, I remarked as much concern for each other's welfare as I have ever found in any other rank or order of society, and a much greater attention to the civilities and courtesies of society than I ever saw among their white fellow-countrymen. Though they are under the necessity, in consequence of their civil disqualifications, of securing themselves against fraud by the presence of a white person, whenever they make a bargain with a member of the favored caste, there is no proof that honesty or punctuality is wanting on their side. That they suffer from the want of both in the other party, is too often the case, and is naturally to be expected while men are disposed to take advantage of the law's injustice.

VISIT AT THE HOUSE OF AN EMANCIPATED SLAVE.

My attention was particularly directed to the respectable appearance of the mistress, an elderly woman,—and the unaffected ease with which she received us. She had the manners and good breeding of a gentlewoman. Her husband, who had been emancipated by his owner, had bought her freedom, and that of her children, for the sum of thirteen hundred and seventy-five dollars. It was after much solicitation, and a considerable lapse of time, that he succeeded in his object, as her master retained her in bondage with the view of enhancing her price, till she had seven children. The husband was obliged to borrow part of the money; and he who is not in a free State, believed on his oath, had his bond for two hundred and fifty dollars accepted in a slave State. The wife and the children were, all this time, maintained by him, and he received no reduction or remuneration whatever on that account.

While we were at tea, I was much distressed by the mistress of the house declining to take anything. As I suspected the reason, I prevailed upon her, at last, to partake of "her own labors," and share in the good things she had provided for us. I told her it was most painful to me to be distinguished in a manner, that to a European mind, conveyed the feelings of self-reproach and humiliation. I was so ashamed and embarrassed by her deference to the folly of my own race, that it was some time before I could make up my mind to ask an explanation involving such odious associations and intreat that I might be exempted from the observance of a usage that I utterly loathe and abominate.

THE MORMON BIBLE.

As the promulgators of this extraordinary legend maintain the natural equality of mankind, without excepting the native Indians or the African race, there is little reason to be surprised at the cruel persecution they have suffered, and still less at the continued accession of converts among those who sympathize with the wrongs of others, or seek an asylum for their own. The preachers and believers of the following doctrines were not likely to remain unmolested in the State of Missouri:

"The Lord God hath commanded that men should not murder; that they should not lie; that they should not steal; &c. He inviteth them all to come to him and partake of his goodness: and he denieth none that come unto him; black and white—bond and free, male and female; and he remembereth the heathen; and all are alike unto God, Jew and Gentile. Your brethren whom ye hate because of their filthiness, and of the cursings that have come upon their skins, are more righteous than you. Wherefore a commandment I give you, which is the word of God, that ye revile no more against them because of the darkness of their skins. It is against the law of our brethren that there should be any slaves among them."

ILLEGALITY OF EMANCIPATION.

Let but the slave-owner give signs of the will, and the slave Legislature will find the way, to emancipate the bond from his wrongs, and the master from his fears. The matter would be easily settled, if the oppressor were as ready to grant freedom, as the oppressed to receive it: for as a French writer (M. de Passemans) says of the Russian serfs, "Un peuple est toujours mûr pour la liberté; mais les hommes qui oppriment le peuple, ne sont pas toujours mûrs pour la justice et l'humanité."

INSULTS TO THE COLORED POPULATION.

In the Philadelphia Directory, the names of the colored inhabitants have a cross prefixed to them. In the Boston Guide you may hunt a long time for them in vain: they are placed at the end of the book by themselves. No place is too high or too low to shelter them from insult.

LAWS TOUCHING FUGITIVE SLAVES.

If a black man's cow is taken from him, twelve honest men assist him to recover his property; if his person is seized, a judge or a magistrate decides on his right to his own body. "I would observe," says Judge Hoffman, "that, as far as concerns the Southern States, without this provision, (giving exclusive jurisdiction to a single magistrate,) our present Government would not have been in existence. *I may say it was the price of that Constitution.*"

TESTIMONY OF THE "FRIENDS."

Among the rules of discipline published at Philadelphia in 1831, is the following:—"We earnestly desire it may become the concern of our members generally, to use the influence they have with those who hold slaves, by inheritance or otherwise, that they may be treated with moderation and kindness, and instructed as objects of the common salvation in the principles of the Christian religion, as well as in such branches of school learning as may fit them for freedom, and to become useful members of society." What is this but an encouragement of Slavery? Talk of *moderation*, indeed, to a man, the very coat on whose back you know to be purchased at the expense of the person for whom you ask it! Tell him to be kind, while you see he knows not how to be just! Advise the open violator of religion to disseminate its principles among those who would thus become the judges, as they are now the victims of his wickedness! Recommend instruction of the very beings from whose ignorance he derives his pelf and his power!—and urge him to prepare his slaves for freedom, when it is the want of that preparation that supplies him with an apology for his guilt, and a motive for its continuance!

CRUELTY TO THE COLORED POPULATION.

I had seen and heard so much of the indignities and cruelties heaped on the heads of this persecuted race, that I had ceased to feel surprised at anything I was told on the subject. Indignation, I trust, I shall never cease to feel; and I blame myself for not having spoken more strongly and more frequently against these enormities. I could perceive I had given great offence, in several quarters, by the expression of my sentiments. It would be more to my honor if I had given more reason for it.

From Mrs. Austin's "German Prose Writers."

EDUCATION OF WOMEN.

"In this secluded situation," said the mistress, "I have been obliged to dispense entirely with the instruction of masters."

"Perhaps," thought I, "because they sometimes insinuate themselves into the good graces of their unsuspecting pupils."

But the Domina, who read this suspicion in my eyes, had totally other reasons in her mind.

"No," said she, "that excessive anxiety to keep young girls from the flatteries of men is far more dangerous than the most reprehensible heedlessness. It is as if one were to rear in a hot-house, plants which are afterwards to be exposed to the open air. As the vigorous plant can resist the assaults of the weather, so a sound judgment, and feelings not pampered into mawkish sensibility, can offer a steady resistance to the suggestions of folly or vice."

It was, therefore, not any moral timorousness which determined her to dispense with the lessons of masters, but the superficiality of their teaching, and the entire uselessness of most of the so-called accomplishments, the only tendency of which is to rob young women of valuable time, and to inspire them with ludicrous and tiresome pretensions.

"The formation of their moral character," she continued, "is the main thing in female education, and I have therefore to object to so-called accomplishments, that they afford dangerous food to vanity and egotism. But my chief objection to masters is their superficiality. If one finds in the world a half-honest teacher who has something like a profound and accurate knowledge of language and science, he will not devote himself to the instruction of women; or, if wished to do so, people will not have him. The pride of men regards our sex as unworthy of serious and profound studies. But how does this determination to condemn us to indistinctness of ideas and frivolity of mind, avenge itself on them! Have you ever happened to be a witness of domestic brawls? of genuine feminine altercations? Where do you hear a single argument? Where is a particle of reason evinced in the replies? Senseless contradiction, endless repetitions, are, to the despair of all belonging to them, the arguments of obstinate and shrewish women. Whence is this, if it does not arise from the superficiality of their education? Believe me, if women were taught to think, reason would not be so entirely thrown away upon them.

"This tyrannical denial of solid instruction recoils, however, in various ways on men, with whom it originates. For the nature of the lot they draw when they marry, depends not on the principles of their wives, but solely on their temperament, which it is very difficult to ascertain beforehand. Now a man educates even his domestic animals; he will have his dog intelligent, his horse docile, his ox steady;—how can it then be a matter of such indifference to him, whether his wife, in the conduct of her household, in the early education of his children, in the intimate conversation of domestic life, displays reason, reflection, and clearness of mind? Married people want to talk with each other in a reasonable manner on various subjects, and of these, many can only be brought to any conclusion by inferences clearly deduced from principles. Now talk of principles with women, as they are generally educated!

"And then domestic life,—what resources of happiness might it afford if women were capable of furnishing more food to the conversation of instructed men! Is it not melancholy to see that each sex has its own separate society? Really, as I have a taste for whatever is decided, I should prefer the harem of the Turks to these assemblies of both sexes, in which the women talk scandal in one corner, and the men politics in another;—as if there could be no community of interests or pleasures between them.

"These things would arrange themselves naturally if the groundwork were put upon a good footing. In order to accomplish this, I have devised a new system, in which the reason is constantly exercised. You will not deny, that without grammar there is no such thing as logic. Now let any one try to teach the grammar of the modern tongues without the help of the ancient. My young pupils certainly learned the most colloquial phrases of French, they tortured German after the fashion of our part of the country; but in all this there was no precision, clearness, or coherence, any more than in the books which we are forced to use in education. But as I perceived the meaning of what learned men have more than once explained to me, as to the causes of the want of all distinctness and accuracy in women's language, I esteemed myself fortunate in the discovery that my excellent assistant is a schoolmaster's daughter, and a good Latin scholar. To avoid frightening my young girls with learning, or exciting the derision of men, I gave out that the Latin was only subsidiary to music,—for this too we study fundamentally or not at all, and therefore we sing the old Corali with the Latin text. This pretext answers very well; and, to give my young ladies courage, I put my own hand to the work, and learned my *musa, musæ* like the least of them.

"But you are going to ask what I mean to do as to Latin books, to most of which I believe some objections may justly be urged.

"I answer, that the important matter for us women is not so much to read Latin books as to learn a language which possesses so many forms, so much certainty and precision."

Rumohr. (*Deutsche Denkwürdigkeiten.*)

From the New Farmer's Journal.

GUANO IN THE ISLAND OF ICHABOE.

It appears from an interesting article in the Glasgow Herald, that it was through the information of an American whaler, at the Cape of Good Hope, given to Captain Farr, an Englishman, that the first cargo of guano was brought to this country from Ichaboe, by the latter, who has since made a second voyage to the island, and pointed out the way to other ships, in accordance with a negotiation entered into with their owners. The writer of the Herald thus concludes:

At the time of Captain Farr's first visit, the island was covered with penguins, gannets, &c. but principally the former, in numbers which altogether defied calculation. They seemed to have no acquaintance with, nor fear of man, and in fact offered no resistance to his encroachments on a domain which had been peculiarly their own for thousands of years. Since the crews of so many ships were located at the island, the birds have almost entirely deserted their former territory, to fulfil the purposes of their nature in more remote and inaccessible shores. The specimens of the penguin from Ichaboe which we have seen, are about two feet in height, and as a great portion of their time is spent in the sea, they are furnished with small flaps, or paddles, instead of wings, which enables them to progress through the water with great velocity, though they are unable to fly. The female lays and sits upon one egg at a time, and a hole scratched in the deposite subserves all the purposes of a nest. In this way a succession of incubations go on for several months in the year, the young bird making its way to the sea as soon as it is able. It is the opinion of the seamen, however, that vast numbers of them never reach their destined home in the waters, but are crushed to death in their progress to it, by the dence battalions of birds, which have almost to maintain a struggle for bare standing-room; and in this way the guano heaps are increased, as well by the bodies of the birds as by their droppings. The bodies of seals are also found on the surface of the guano deposites, which leads to the belief that they may have occasionally taken shelter there from the potency of the ammonical vapor, have been unable to return to the water, and died where they lay.

The guano which is brought to this country, is found under a loose covering of decayed birds, recent dung, &c. and is so firmly imbedded that it requires to be dug out by laborious operations of the pick-axe. When thus disengaged, it is put into bags, and transferred by means of a sort of a rope ladder, from the island to the boat, which lies at the outer edge of the surf, and thence it is daily emptied into the hold of the vessel, which is anchored at a short distance. Ten men will lift about fifteen tons per day, but the operation is a very laborious one, and the sun is so powerful, that few of the crews escape without having their faces and hands blistered so that the outer skin is peeled off. The trip to and from the island extends to from fifty-five to seventy days, or, including the time necessary to take in a cargo, a voyage out and home extends to from six to seven months. When Captain Farr left Ichaboe, he estimated the guano deposit on that island alone to extend to one thousand feet in length, by five hundred feet in breadth, with an average depth of thirty-five feet, containing, perhaps, from 700,000 to 800,000 tons. It is evident, therefore, that this supply will soon be exhausted in fertilizing the soil of Great Britain and her dependencies, but it is to be hoped that vast stores of it yet exist, which have hitherto never been disturbed by man. On this subject we quote the following cheering statement from the South African Commercial Advertiser, published at Capetown in January last:

"On the rocky headlands, or on the rocky and unmolested islands on the west coast, both within and beyond the boundary of this colony, where the seafowl, from the vast expanse of the ocean, come to breed, enormous masses of the manure have recently been discovered; and it seems probable that all the way up the coast into the gulf of Guinea, and beyond it, similar treasures await the agriculture of the world, by which means the sea will render back to the land much more matter fitted to form organized, that is, vegetable and animal substances, than the rivers carry down into its depths, or the fleets of nations deposite in their course over its surface."

From Punch.

ASKING A LOAN—AND THE ANSWER.

From a Gentleman to a Friend, soliciting his Acceptance and Bond.

MY DEAR RICHARDS,—In this, our fleeting life, how few are the opportunities afforded us of really testing the hearts of our friends! Sorry, indeed, should I be for my own nature, were I of the barren creed of those who, from the depths of their would-be-wisdom, smile knowingly at friendship, as though, like the word phœnix, it spoke of something very fine, but very fabulous; a spicy monster, building in the clouds, and never known to descend upon our earth. No; I should be among the most insensible of my kind—a very savage of social life—did I fail to worship friendship in my innermost heart as a virtue illustrated by one of the noblest of created men. Forgive me if I do not name him; for true worth, like the rose, *will* blush at its own sweetness!

Truly, it is pleasant to hear men abuse the world, as though, forsooth, they themselves were the only shining exceptions from the general selfishness they condemn. When I hear a man cry out, "It is a bad world," I must of course lump him with the aggregate iniquity; for how can he have the enormous vanity to select himself as the only pure Adam from naughty millions? No, Richards; be it my faith to think the best of the world; be it my special felicity to know that I hold the heart—ay, as though it were in my hand—of the truest and the best of friends. But what, indeed, is friendship, if it be not active? What, but a harp, or the divinest of Cremonas, resting in silence—all the melodious, ravishing sounds that waft our spirits to the clouds, sleeping in their strings, a dumb sleep? So is it with the heart of a true friend until touched by the wants of his companion.

My dear Richards, I enclose you a bill of a hundred and fifty pounds. That bill, like the harp or fiddle I have spoken of, is now as a dead thing. But only write across it "Accepted, John Richards," and it will have a voice of gold—yes, it will ring with sovereigns. Oh, friendship! thou divinest alchemist, that man should ever profane thee! Send the bill back by post, as I *must* have the cash to-morrow.

I have many acquaintance, any of whom would have gone through the little form, (for it is only a form) I ask of you. But no: I should have thought such an act on my part, a treason to our friendship. You know, my dear boy, that I am apt to be imaginative; and thus, it is a sweet and peculiar pleasure to me to fancy both our names linked indissolubly together—the union legalized by a five shilling stamp,—each adding value to the other by being paired. Thus, it almost seems to me, that we merge two souls into one—that in very truth, by the potent spell of friendship, we are no longer single, but bound together by a bond unknown to those pagans of ancient time, Orestes and Pylades, Damon and Pythias!

Yes; with a slight flourish of the pen, we shall feel what I once thought impossible, a greater interest in one another. We shall know that our names, written upon accredited paper, pass in the world as symbols of gold; you will have turned ink drops into ready money, and *I* shall have received it. The roses that wreath around the stamp are to my mind's eye, Richards, the very types of our kindred minds. Do not, however, fail to post the bill to-night.

There is—I believe he calls it—a bond on my account for three or four hundreds to which a troublesome attorney wants your name. Come and breakfast with me on Monday, my dear boy, and it shall be ready for you. Heaven bless you. Your friend, to the Place of Tombs,

MONTAGUE ST. GEORGE.

P. S. I have a *pate de foie gras*, which I don't think you ever tasted, from Paris, for Monday. It's made of geese's-liver. They put the live goose before the fire and make it drink and drink. Rather cruel, but there's no mistake in the liver.

The Friend's Answer, Refusing both Acceptance and Bond.

MY DEAR MONTAGUE,—Your letter has given me great pleasure. You know how highly I have always thought of friendship; it as, you say, a divine thing. Indeed, to my mind so divine, that it should never, no never, be mixed up with money.

Nevertheless, however we may differ on this little point, it is impossible for me to speak as I feel on your letter. It is charmingly written. There is a beauty, a fervor in your sentiments about friendship that convince me you have felt its treasures, and are therein, though poor in the world's esteem, rich as an emperor. My dear friend, cultivate this style of writing. I am certain money is to be made by it.

I agree with you as to your opinion of the world—it is a glorious world—and glorious, indeed, are some of the people in it. The friendship that has so long subsisted between us, must make me acknowledge this. Your simile of a friend and a fiddle is perfect and touching. What, indeed, are they both made for, if not to be played upon?

Your picture of the unison of souls, when both the souls' hands are to the same bill, is beautiful, affecting. I have read the passage over twenty times. It has neither one word too many or too few. The picture is perfect: a cabinet gem to be locked up in one's heart. The unison of souls is a charming phrase; but, unhappily, my friend, it is too fine, of too subtle an essence to be acknowledged and respected by the coarse men of the world. The sheriff, for instance, cares not for souls, only inasmuch as they are in bodies. Now, unhappily, so far as we know, disembodied souls do not draw or accept; otherwise, what felicity would it be to me to meet and mingle with your spirit on a five-shilling stamp.

I confess, too, that it is tempting to think that, by the alchemy of a few ink-drops, I could put a hundred and fifty gold pieces, (bating the discount,) in the purse of my friend. Alas! if the ceremony began and ended with ink. I would spend a Black Sea upon you. You should have my name ten thousand times multiplied, with a good wish in every stroke, hair and thick.

That you have eschewed so many acquaintance, all happy with clean-nibbed pens, to accept for you, and in the fullness of your friendship selected me, is a compliment, nay more, it is an evidence of your affection which I—I hope to deserve.

You know that *I*, as well as yourself, am apt to be imaginative. Imaginations, however, fly not always together. You say, that by accepting the bill, our souls would be united. My dear friend, for three months, I should feel ourselves growing together, every day strengthening the process. I should feel as if I breathed for two; nay, I should hardly turn in my bed unincumbered. I should, in my fancy, become a double man, with only single strength to bear about my added load. You know the story of Sinbad and the Old Man of the Mountain? That is a fine allegory, though not understood. The truth is, the Old Man drew a bill, and Sinbad—guileless tar!—accepted it.

You speak of the roses that wreathe about the stamp. They are, indeed, very pretty. But, somehow, my eye fell upon the thistles; which I doubt not, the benevolence of Her Majesty causes to be embossed there; thistles, clearly significant that the man who accepts a bill, save for his own debt, is an ass. I am, on the contrary,

Your affectionate friend,

JOHN RICHARDS.

P. S. I can't come on Monday, and I don't like *pate de foie gras*. Why, in the name of mercy, shold geese be treated as you describe? *They* never accept other gesse's bills.

From the Free Wesleyan.

ISAAC T. HOPPER, AND THE METHODIST SLAVE-HOLDER.

During the late session of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the city of New-York, that well known friend to the slave, Isaac T. Hopper, was introduced to three young ladies, daughters of a slaveholding Methodist preacher, from Mississippi. Said the Friend at whose house they were visiting, "This is Isaac Hopper, one of the most rabid Abolitionists in the North. And these," turning to the ladies, "are the daughters of a slaveholder from the South."

By this means they were soon well known to each other. And the conversation which ensued, with other interesting incidents, I will give in the language of Friend Hopper, who related it to me to-day.

"They were very intelligent girls. I was much pleased with them. One of them assured me, however, that they could not do without the slaves."

"'Why, Mr. Hopper,' said she, 'I never dressed or undressed myself until I came to the North.—And I did not know what to do when I left home: I felt inclined to bring a servant with me.'

"'I wish thee had brought one,' said I.

"'Why? What would you have done, Mr. Hopper, if you had seen her?'

"'I should have told her that she was a free woman now, but if she went back to the South she would go as a pig or a sheep, to be sold if occasion called for it.'

"They only laughed at the frankness thus expressed, and continued the conversation for some time, on the same subject. I then told them I should like to see them at my house with their father. And in a few days they came, very much to my satisfaction. We had a long talk about Slavery.

"Said this preacher, 'Mr. Hopper, do you say and think that I am not a Christian?'

"'I certainly do not regard thee as a Christian.'

"'Why, Mr. Hopper? do you think I cannot get to heaven?'

"'That I will not say. But Slavery is a great abomination, and no one who is guilty of it can be a Christian or Christ-like. I would not exclude thee from the kingdom of heaven. To thy own Master thou dost stand or fall. If thou dost enter there, it will be on the ground of ignorance of the fact that thou art living in sin.'

"We reasoned on it at some length, when the conversation turned upon the conduct of Abolitionists.

"Said the preacher, 'If the Abolitionists were all like you and Mr. Gibbons, we could come to some agreement on this matter. Why, I never was treated so well by any body as you and Mr. Gibbons, your abolition friend, have treated me. But your Abolitionists generally are so violent and abusive.'

"A Friend present remarked to him that none were more generally execrated, as vile and abusive Abolitionists, than was the 'notorious Hopper,' as the Southern papers call him. I then said the slaveholders love and make a lie in this thing.'

"'Well,' said he, 'we should be glad to see you with us, Friend Hopper, on a visit.'

"'Ah! and thou wouldst lynch me, or thy friends would, if they caught me.'

"'O no, sir: we would treat you well. But how would you do about Slavery when there?'

"'Why, I should tell the slaves to be obedient, faithful, industrious, and never think of running away from a good master, unless they were sure they could escape! and in that case be off as soon as possible! for if caught, they would fare much worse than they do now. And I would say to thee, that as thou claimest to be a minister of Jesus Christ, consistency of character and the spirit of thy Master require thee to give deliverance to the captive—to let the oppressed go free.'

"Before we separated I saw tears in his eyes. I appealed to him closely, and bore a faithful testimony.

"'My friend, dost thou have a conscience void of offence? When thou liest down at night, is thy mind always at ease? After pouring out thy soul in prayer to thy Maker, dost thou not feel the outraged sense of right, like a perpetual motion, restless and disquieted within thy breast, telling thee 'tis wrong to hold these men in slavery,—their wives and their little ones?'

"To this he answered frankly, that sometimes he doubted; yet upon the whole, he thought it best and right. When they were about leaving, one of his daughters, a young widow, thus addressed me:

"'Mr. Hopper, I thank God for this privilege. I never saw and talked with an Abolitionist before. I am now persuaded that slaveholding is sinful in the sight of God. When my husband died, he left me several slaves. I have held them for five years.—But I return home now, resolved to be the owner of a slave no longer.' We bade each other farewell."

This narrative has interested me. I think it will edify the reader. It teaches the sentiment: Abolition is the truth of God. Slaveholders may be happily influenced by it. And the relation which proslavery men sustain, is that of tattlers and mischief-makers, between Abolitionists and slaveholders.—Let these alone, and the issue will be a fair one and fairly met. L. C. MATLACK.

Philadelphia, Aug. 16.

MARRIAGE RATHER THAN LAW.

A certain widow lady placed her child at nurse in one of the foundling hospitals of Germany, and intending to leave it there until it should be old enough to begin receiving an education, paid the stipend for four years. About the same time a gentleman placed his child in the same institution, and it was consigned to the same nurse. The gentleman then made a voyage to South America, where he had some business of importance that needed his attention. At the end of the four years the lady returned to take away her child; and by a somewhat singular coincidence, the gentleman arrived at the same time, with the same object. But in the interim one of the children had died, and the nurse could not declare positively whether it was that of the widow or the other; the widow claimed the survivor as her own; the gentleman insisted as strongly that his was the living child. The dispute waxed warm, and a resort to the legal tribunals was threatened on either side, when a worthy clergyman interposed and with such effect that the disputants soon agreed to consolidate their claims to the surviving child by marriage. So says a French paper.—*Com Adv.*

FINDING FAULT WITH AN EDITOR'S GRAMMAR.—We cut the following from the Boston Courier. It tells its own story:

BOSTON, AUGUST 23, 1844.

May a clerk venture to ask the *senior* editor of the Courier if, in his paper of this day, Mr. Tyler has "built himself" or "a house?" From the paragraph either case might be construed. S.

The "senior editor" is happy to inform "a clerk," that President Tyler is supposed to have built *for* himself a house; and further, that Mr. Tyler has built the said house on his plantation, in Virginia, and not, as the clerk seems to imagine, *in the Courier of yesterday.*

WOMAN'S CHARITY.—That was a beautiful idea of the wife of an Irish schoolmaster, who, whilst poor himself, had given gratuitous instruction to poor scholars, but when increased in worldly goods, began to think he could not give his services for nothing:

"Oh, James don't say the like 'o that," said the gentle-hearted woman, "don't; a poor scholar never came into the house that I didn't feel as *if he brought fresh air from heaven with him*—I never miss the bit I gave them—my heart warms for the soft homely sound of their bare feet on the floor, and the door almost opens of itself to let them in."

A CHILD TO BOAST OF.—A farmer's wife, in speaking of the smartness, aptness, and intelligence of her son, a lad six years old, to a lady acquaintance, said: "He can read fluently in any part of the bible, repeat the whole catechism, and weed onions as well as his father." "Yes, mother," added the young hopeful, "and yesterday I licked Ned Rawson, thro'd the cat in the well, and stole old Hinckley's gimblet."

Graham House, 63 Barclay St.

CITIZENS, or transient visitors desiring a quiet home, where a real Temperance diet is proffered them, consisting of Vegetables, Fruits, &c. without stimulants or flesh meats, are invited to patronize this house. Terms moderate. Shower-baths free,

August 8. ROSWELL GOSS.

Books,

For Sale at the Office of the American A. S. Society, 142 Nassau St. N. Y.

THE LIBERTY BELL of 1844, an Annual, published for the Massachusetts Fair, and consisting of various original articles, from the ablest Anti-Slavery writers in this country, Great Britain and Ireland.

XIMENA, AND OTHER POEMS, by *James Bayard Taylor*. Philadelphia, 1844.

THE BROTHERHOOD OF THIEVES, or a true picture of the AMERICAN CHURCH AND CLERGY, by *S. S. Foster*; and various other standard Anti-Slavery works.

New-York, July 4, 1844.

TEXAN REVOLUTION.

Republished (with additions) at Washington, D. C., from the Northampton (Mass.) Gazette.

To which is added,—

A LETTER FROM WASHINGTON, ON THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS, AND THE LATE OUTRAGE IN CALIFORNIA—REPUBLISHED, WITH ADDITIONS FROM THE LIBERATOR. By Probus.

This is a pamphlet of about 100 large octavo pages Only a small part consists of the republications; the additions being ten or twelve times larger than the originals. The subjects discussed, are:—

I. The history and merits of the Texan Revolution, under the following heads:

1. The perfidy of the President, and the lawless proceedings of citizens of the United States, who went to Texas "to sow a rebellion."

2. Kindness, hospitality, and generosity of the Mexicans; ingratitude and treachery of the revolutionists.

3. Pretexts of the Revolution. Under this head is a very full account of the political changes which have taken place in Mexico, and of their causes;—the working of the Federative or Federal form of Government, as compared with the Consolidated or Central, in the South American States; a comparative history of *Nullification* in Mexico and the United States; the difference between the South American Federal and Central systems substantially that between our present form of government, and the form proposed by ALEXANDER HAMILTON; the political history of the South American States, and the history and prospects of nullification in the United States, some test of the comparative value of the two systems.

4. Real Causes of the Texan Revolution.

II. The subject of the second Part, or Letter, is the design of annexing Texas to this Union, *at the first session of the next Congress.* The subdivisions of this subject are:—

1. Review of a letter (said to have been, originally, private,) of ex-Governor Gilmer, of Virginia, on the necessity of the speedy annexation of Texas.

2. The principles, speeches, reports, official correspondence, and operations of the leading and confidential friends of John Tyler, in the Cabinet, and in Congress; the alliance between them and the leading members of the democratic party for the extension and perpetuation of slavery and the slave trade, by the acquisition of Texas and California; the outrage committed by Commodore Jones in the latter province, a part, and in execution, of the secret schemes of the cabinet, and a natural result of their spirit and purposes; the ostensible reasons for that outrage examined.

3. The determination and tendency of their policy to bring about a war between the United States of the one part, and Mexico and Great Britain of the other; it being perfectly understood that the former cannot be despoiled of territory fifteen times as large as the State of New-York, and eighty times as large as Massachusetts, without war with Great Britain, as well as with her

4. The Oregon Bill, a part of the said schemes.

5. The questions of *Visitation* and *Search*, on the coast of Africa, for the arrest of slave trading pirates; the actual extent of the slave trade, and its exclusive prosecution under the American flag; the Quintuple and Ashburton Treaties, Gen. Cass's pamphlet and correspondence in France.

6. Negotiations of our government with Mexico for the cession of Texas and California, from the accession of Gen. Jackson to the present time; Character and proceedings of Messrs. Poinsett and Butler, ministers of the United States, in Mexico; suppression, and probable destruction of official documents; *corruption* brought to light; correspondence of Messrs. Webster and Thompson, with Messrs. de Bocanegra and Almonte; *mistranslations*, in our Department of State, and in our Legation at Mexico, of Mexican official documents.

APPENDIX.

1. John Quincy Adams's opinion of the conduct of our government towards Mexico, extracted from his address to his constituents, September 12, 1842.

2. Collection of Proclamations of neutrality, issued by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Van Buren, and Tyler.

☞ For Sale at this Office.

Education and Industry!

THE Northampton Association of Education and Industry have appropriated a suitable tenement for the accommodation of fifteen or twenty boarding pupils. They will be members of a family, under the care of the Director of Education, assisted by his wife, and other teachers, and will be subject to the same treatment and regulations as pupils who are members of the association.—The name of the association indicates the idea of culture, towards the realization of which our efforts will be directed. Systematic, habitual industry is deemed indispensable to education, which should aim at the harmonious development of the physical, intellectual, moral, and religious tendencies in active, practical life.

We shall consider $100 a year as an equivalent for instruction and board; from which a suitable deduction will be made when a pupil comes for several years. The year will commence on the 1st of May, next, and will have no fixed and entire vacation. Pupils will be received for a year at any time.

O. MACK, *Director of Education.*

BROUGHTON MEADOWS,
Northampton, April 14, 1844.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

(Second Edition.)

JUST Published, and for sale at this office, a new work on Capital Punishment. By Charles Spear. It contains a variety of thrilling and instructive anecdotes; also, all the capital offenses in every State in the Union; and a speech from O'Connell on the subject. Also, several instances of the execution of the *innocent*. Facts are drawn from history and observation, and the entire scripture ground has been examined. The work is embellished with a fine engraving. Price, 62 1-2 cents.

PHILADELPHIA ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE.

No. 31, *North Fifth street.*

The National Anti-Slavery Standard, will be issued regularly from this office, on Thursday of every week.

TERMS—the same as in New-York; i. e. $2,00 a year if paid in advance; $2,50 if not paid within six months. $10,00 in advance will pay for six copies for one year, sent to one address; and $30,00 will pay for